DEC 2 1 1960

STUDIES IN NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTIANITY

STUDIES
IN
NEW TESTAMENT
CHRISTIANITY

BY
GEORGE A. BARTON
PH.D., D.D., LL.D.

Professor of Semitic Languages and History of Religions, University of Pennsylvania; Professor of New Testament Literature and Language, Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia

2761

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
BS
2361
.B3
1928
50,829

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

PHILADELPHIA
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1928

COPYRIGHT, 1928, BY UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To

THE MEMORY OF

The Right Reverend Phillips Brooks, D. D.

IN VENERATION AND GRATITUDE

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

DEC 21 1960

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

PREFACE

In the ferment caused by the application of scientific methods to all departments of study it is difficult for some to keep religion in touch with reality. We have so long thought of the Apostolic Age as a time so different from our own, we have looked at it through such a haze of tradition and reverence, we have supposed that it was so interpenetrated with the supernatural, that to many there seems an unbridgeable chasm between it and us. It is with the hope that the studies in this volume may do something, however small, to make the great forces, which in the first century began the transformation of the world, seem real and still potent, that the writer ventures to permit their publication.

Chapter I on "The Fulfilment of Prophecy" was written in 1920 as an address before the Thursday Evening Club of Bethlehem, Pa., and was in 1923 printed in the *Parish Messenger* of the Church of the Saviour, Philadelphia. The other chapters have all been written since the beginning of 1927, though they are the fruit of many years of study. Chapter VI on "The Eucharist" was read at the Conference of the National Church League in Philadelphia on February 15, 1927, and was published in the *Churchman* of March 26, 1927. It has also been issued by the Church League in pamphlet form. The *Churchman* has kindly permitted its republication. Chapter V was read at the Clericus Club of Philadelphia on April 25 and to the Convocation of Reading meeting at Allentown, Pa., on May 4, 1927.

None of the themes treated is studied exhaustively; those who desire such treatment must look elsewhere. It is hoped, however, that these brief, rapid sketches may help busy people to understand something of the variety of thought and life of the Apostolic Age and to catch something of its spirit.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

CONTENTS

		PAGE
I	The Fulfilment of Prophecy	1
II	The Person of Christ	17
III	God	41
IV	Sin	63
V	The Death of Christ	81
VI	The Eucharist	102
VII	The Christian Life	116
	Index of Authors	145
	Index of Scripture References	146

CHAPTER I

THE FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY

I

Until recently the theory of the inspiration of Scripture which prevailed everywhere in Christian circles was that known as verbal or plenary inspiration. It grew out of the naïve, unscientific conceptions of the animistic period of human development. Ignorant of psychology and of the possibilities of the human mind, men of the animistic period of human thought believed that a spirit (it might be demon or angel) had taken possession of a man whenever he did anything unusual. An insane man was thought to be possessed of a demon; one, lifted out of himself so that he spoke great, inspiring words of truth, had, it was believed, been taken possession of by the Spirit of God. In either case the man was an automaton. The spirit was thought to speak through him. The words were not human words; the thoughts were not human thoughts.

Naturally, as the result of that theory of inspiration, prophecy was thought to be the utterance of detailed descriptions of future events. Men had a right to expect the literal fulfilment of every detail. By means of prophecy one could map out the events of the future. This view of inspiration and of prophecy has been shattered by the literary and historical study of the Bible. It is now evident to one who reads the Bible with any degree of thoughtfulness, that its writers were not mere automata, moved by a spirit that so took possession of them that their own powers were superseded. Each retained his own peculiar style, his own personal limitations, his own point of view. Each shared in the point of view and in the limitations of his age as to knowledge. Inspiration was enjoyed by them in different degrees. At its best, inspiration lifted

the powers of a Biblical writer to their highest efficiency; its especial function was to enable the inspired man to grasp ethical and spiritual truth—to see more clearly than his fellows into the nature of God and men—into the conduct of life—into questions of duty.

As is well known, writings that could be called prophetic are of two classes, the prophetic books proper, and the apocalypses. In prophetic books, ordinarily so called, the prophet speaks out like a preacher. Indeed most of these books are made up of notes of discourses that were spoken by the prophets. Apocalypses developed after 200 B. C. when prophecy had died out. Men no longer dared to speak out openly or write in their own names the message of God as the prophets had done; they knew they would not get a hearing, if they did. They therefore cast what they had to say in the form of visions, which they usually attributed to some saint who had lived before—generally long before; Enoch, or Moses, or Isaiah, or the twelve sons of Jacob, or Daniel or Ezra, or Baruch, or John.[1] Between 200 B. C. and 100 A. D. many such apocalypses were written. Seven were attributed to Enoch, seven to Baruch and one or more to each of the other holy men mentioned. Of these, two, Daniel and John, found their way into the Biblical Canon. That of Ezra, as II or IV Esdras, is contained in the Old Testament Apocrypha.

Apocalypses were products of the study. They betray, many of them, the greatest moral earnestness, but they smell of the lamp. Their writers had a common material on which they drew. This material was unfulfilled prophecy and the weird imagery of the Babylonian creation epic and possibly other kindred material. Each writer so shaped his material that the history that lay between him and the time of the saint in whose name he was writing was recounted in the form of prophecies. When the narrative had reached the time of the actual writer of the apocalypse, then the coming of the kingdom of God was predicted. This prediction was always in much less definite outline than the predictions of the events which preceded.

[1] The Book of Revelation, however, may really have been written by one who bore the name of John.

II

The result of an inductive study of all these prophetic writings discloses three facts or principles, which I will first state, and concerning which I shall then adduce proof. These are:

(1) That by a kind of premonition, which is psychologically credible, the greatest prophets sometimes correctly predicted the course of events in the future that lay immediately before their people, and could be fulfilled within a few years.

(2) That in predicting events of the distant future or in setting forth ideals that could only be realized in the lapse of centuries, no prophet has ever correctly predicted any considerable number of important details. The nature of the fulfilment can never be clearly discerned from the prophecy. It is only in looking back that one can discern that the prophecy has been fulfilled.

(3) It was the function of the prophet dimly to discern an ideal and to set it forth in such a way as to stir the faith and quicken the ethical life of his people. Psychologically it was only possible for him to clothe his vision of the ideal state in concepts current in his own time. Fulfilment has always been of a different, a more spiritual, a more glorious character than anything in the form of the prophecy would lead one to guess.

Let me cite a few examples in support of these propositions.

(1) As to the first of them, we may find proof in the prediction of the prophet Isaiah recorded in Isaiah 7, uttered in the year 735 B. C. to King Ahaz. At the moment this prediction was uttered Pekah, king of Israel, and Rezin, king of Damascus, were threatening to invade Jerusalem unless King Ahaz would join them in rebelling against Assyria. Amid the consternation that the threat produced in Jerusalem, Isaiah sought to give courage and poise to the king. He told him that a young woman would conceive and bring forth a son; she would have such faith in God that she would name her child Immanuel, "God is with us." In the time of the prophet Amos, Immanuel was already an old watchword of the worshippers of Jehovah (Amos 5: 14). "That

faith will be justified," said Isaiah, " for before the child shall be old enough to discern between good and evil the lands of the kings of whom you are afraid will be desolated." Within two years that prophecy was fulfilled. Tiglath Pileser III came into Palestine in 733 B. C., Pekah was deposed and killed and much of his land desolated by transportation of the wealthier inhabitants. Damascus, which for a hundred years had held out against all the attacks of successive Assyrian monarchs, also fell.

Another instance we may find in the case of the prophet Jeremiah, who persistently told his people that, unless they were loyal to King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, Jerusalem and the temple would be destroyed—a prediction which was fulfilled in the year 586 B. C.

Still another instance of this may be found in the fulfilments of the predictions of that great unknown prophet, who composed Isaiah 40-55 and whom we call II Isaiah. Through ten years he predicted that Cyrus would conquer Babylon and would make it possible for Jerusalem and the desolate cities of Judea to be rebuilt—a prediction which was fulfilled in 538 B. C., when Cyrus overthrew Nabonidus, the last king of the Neo-Babylonian dynasty, and issued an edict, record of which we still have in cuneiform, permitting all captive peoples to return and build their cities and the sanctuaries of their gods.

Each of these prophets was a devout, religious man. Each of them carried forward to ground not occupied before the religious or the ethical conceptions of his people. Each possessed a spirit psychically sensitive to approaching events which bore on the ethical and religious problems of his time. Each one of them may have based his prediction, in part, on knowledge such as any statesman of the time possessed. Isaiah, for example, must have known the energy and ability with which Tiglath Pileser III had for ten years crushed every rebel that had arisen against him. His two-year siege of Arvad (742-740) and his destruction of it in 740, must have been well known in Jerusalem.

So, too, Jeremiah probably had enough political acumen to weigh more accurately than many of his countrymen the energy

of Nebuchadnezzar and the great resources of the Neo-Babylonian realm as compared with the energy of Hophra of Egypt, and the resources of that somewhat decadent country.

All the time that II Isaiah was uttering his prophecies about Cyrus, Cyrus was, as a Babylonian chronicle now informs us, a well-known figure. Year by year echoes of the campaigns of Cyrus in eastern Iran and in Asia Minor reverberated in Babylonia. The way in which Cyrus treated conquered peoples may well have been a matter of common report.

Pure minds, psychologically sensitive, sometimes have premonitions of approaching events.[1] These prophecies were such premonitions. That the details of the predictions were so nearly correct is doubtless due to the fact that the general circumstances upon which fulfilment depended were, as has been pointed out, so well known to the speakers.

(2) As to the second of the theses laid down above, it will be sufficient briefly to survey Messianic prophecy and its fulfilment. The word Messiah means, as is well known, "anointed" or "the anointed one," and in early Hebrew life was applied to kings, because they only of the people had been anointed with sacred fat or oil. At the beginning of the Hebrew monarchy Saul was "the Lord's Anointed" or "the Lord's Messiah"; see e. g., 1 Samuel 24:4-6. Later David became "the Lord's Messiah"; 2 Samuel 19:21.

In the time of the Prophet Isaiah, when Assyria was robbing the land of its independence, that prophet looked forward to a time when a king should arise who would be great in mind, great as a warrior, and great as a statesman—in other words, a wonder-counsellor, a god of a warrior, a father of booty, and a prince of peace (Isa. 9:6).

Later in his life, when the hot blood of youth had cooled, the prophet thought not only of the ideal king, but more of the ideal kingdom. He then pictured the king as one on whom the spirit of the Lord should so rest that he would rule in justice, and the kingdom as a place where the wolf should lie down with the lamb,

[1] Cf. J. H. Kaplan, *The Psychology of Prophecy,* Philadelphia, 1908.

the leopard with the kid, the calf and the young lion together, and a little child should lead them (Isa. 11:1-8).

A century passed, and no such king arose. Instead, Nebuchadnezzar blotted out the Jewish kingdom. Some seven more decades passed, and under Darius the Persian, Zerubbabel, a descendant of David, was governor of Jerusalem. Rebellions were occurring in all parts of the Persian dominions, and the Jews apparently rebelled too. They thought that Zerubbabel was the promised king or Messiah. In this they were sadly mistaken. Zerubbabel was crushed by the Persians. Years dragged on. Under Artaxerxes III about 350, the Jews rebelled, but Persia again trampled them under her feet. When the territories of Alexander the Great were divided between his generals, Judah became a football between Egypt and Syria. Thus the slow centuries dragged on until Antiochus Epiphanes in 168 B. C. endeavored to blot out altogether the worship of Israel's God. Meantime prophecy had died out, and apocalypse had arisen in its stead. Apocalypse moved in a much more supernatural region than prophecy. Shaped in part by an allegorical use of the Babylonian creation epic, which abounded in weird forms and supernatural images, apocalypse transformed both the earlier conceptions of the Messiah and of the Messianic kingdom. The Messiah gradually became a heavenly being who was to come down from above, or, if, as some apocalyptists believed, born on the earth, caught up to heaven to await the divinely chosen time of his descent to the world. Little by little the kingdom was transformed from one that could be established by natural means, to a kingdom that was to be inaugurated by a cataclysmic upheaval. Fantastic ideas of the wonders of the Messianic time prevailed. It was said that that time would be characterized by great plenty. "The earth," says the apocalypse of Baruch, "will yield its fruit ten thousandfold, and on one vine there will be a thousand branches, and each branch will bear a thousand clusters, and each cluster will produce a thousand grapes, and each grape will produce a cor of wine." (A cor was 49 gallons!) The Messianic time was, it was believed, to be inaugurated by a great feast.

So much for the prophecy. What was the fulfilment? Jesus, the Messiah, came as a peasant carpenter. By whatever theory we explain the fact—whether by the Kenosis doctrine or some other—he had a real human consciousness—a human development—" he grew in wisdom as well as in stature." When, at his baptism, he became conscious that he was the Messiah, he retired to the solitary wilderness to adjust himself to this almost unbelievable call. How was it possible that he, a peasant carpenter, should fulfil this mission that apocalyptists had protrayed in such supernatural colors? The story of his temptation is the story of how he adjusted himself to that call. At first he was so absorbed in contemplating the new destiny that had opened before him, that he forgot the demands of the body. When at last the pangs of hunger rudely awakened him from his reverie, he began to doubt the reality of his Messianic mission. Was it possible that he, a helpless peasant, alone and hungry in a barren region full of stones, could be the one who was to inaugurate the Messianic age of feasting and fabulous plenty! If, by some magic word, he could turn into bread the many stones with which the hilltop where he was sitting, as well as every other hilltop in Palestine, was covered, then it might be, but unless he could do this, how *could* it be? Then he remembered some great words of Deuteronomy, which set forth the fact that, necessary as bread is to the life of man, there is something that is still more needed—obedience to the will of God—and he saw that his mission was to be to establish, not a material plenty to make men fat animals, but a commonwealth in which God should directly rule over every soul. Similarly, when the thought occurred to him that he should proclaim himself the expected king and call the people to arms, enter upon political conquests, and seek to make Jerusalem instead of Rome mistress of the world, he put the thought aside. To enter upon this course would be to worship Satan. Accomplishment of the will of God by men in such a way that God would directly rule their hearts and the kingdom of God be established, could not be inaugurated in that way. He must win men's hearts by love, not their material possessions through subjection by fear.

From the wilderness of temptation Jesus went forth to his ministry. He called himself Son of Man, a term that meant "human being." It had, however, in the apocalypse of Enoch, been employed a hundred years before of the Messiah. It at once concealed his Messianic claim but also might, to the thoughtful, suggest it. He talked much of the Kingdom of God; he sought to convey the conception of it that he had formed before he began to preach. It was not till the end of his ministry that his closest disciples grasped the fact that he claimed to be the Messiah. Even then, although they had known him intimately, and had listened to his wonderful teaching, the current Messianic expectations were so fixed in their minds that they could not dissociate themselves from them.

Indeed it is one of the insoluble psychological problems of the life of Jesus, how far he himself in his teaching laid aside the current apocalyptic language.[1] Incarnated as a Jew of the first century, he may have shared the current views to a greater degree than we ordinarily suppose.

However this may be, his disciples never dissociated the Kingdom of God which he proclaimed from the kingdom painted in the apocalyptic literature, and, in many of the New Testament books, passed it on to later generations as the word of God, yet to be fulfilled. Jesus had, they believed, been taken up to Heaven only that, in the fulness of time, he might return on the clouds and establish the kingdom of apocalyptic expectation. Leaving the subsequent history for a few moments, let us pause to ask ourselves in what way Old Testament Messianic prophecy was fulfilled in Christ.

The only candid reply that one who knows the facts can make is this: the prophets longed for a better day—for an ideal society. They were thoroughly convinced that at some time God would raise up from their people one who would inaugurate such a society. They expressed their convictions in the only forms in which they could conceive an ideal society—a kingdom governed

[1] This topic is further discussed in chapter II.

by an ideal king. As time passed, Jewish expectations, in an age guiltless of anything that could be called a scientific spirit—an age that lived in an Arabian Nights' world—became more fantastic. In Jesus Christ the expectations of the prophets were indeed fulfilled. He inaugurated an ideal society—a kingdom of God; but it was of a nature so much more spiritual and moral—so much more democratic than any prophet could possibly conceive—that the literal language of no single prophet (with one apparent exception) applied to him. Their words were but the temporary clothing of an ideal that they only half apprehended. They were not magic utterances wafted across the centuries, nor literal descriptions of future events. In this sense Jesus did not fulfil the prophecies, and they will in all probability never in that sense be fulfilled. God did fulfil them, however, by sending One to inaugurate a kingdom more ideal, more divine, more really glorious, than any prophet could conceive. It was not the words of prophets that were fulfilled. It was their ideal that was put in the way of realization—a way far more desirable than it was possible for them, centuries in advance, to imagine.

As noted a moment ago, there is one seeming exception to this, but, upon examination, it proves not to be an exception. During Israel's Babylonian exile there lived a prophet who brooded much over the problem of his people's sufferings. Why had God permitted them to be conquered, trampled upon, torn from their land, disfigured out of all semblance to a nation? At last, as he pondered upon this, light broke upon him. Israel had suffered, not for her own sins but for the sins of the nations. She had suffered that she might bring to the hearts of the nations a knowledge of the true God—that she might bring the nations to him. This thought he sets forth in many passages. In the most dramatic of them he represents the kings of the nations as standing and gazing at Israel, and thinking how he was "despised and rejected," how he was "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," when the meaning of it all dawns upon them, and they exclaim, "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows. He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised

for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and by his stripes we are healed" (Isa. 53).

It was thus that this great prophet thought that his nation was to save the world. He had, however, conceived for a nation a duty that a nation, composed as any nation is, of good and bad, of idealists and selfish materialists, is unsuited to perform, and Israel as a whole, in spite of the efforts made in the last two pre-Christian centuries to win the world, sadly failed in the effort. The rôle of suffering savior which the prophet conceived for his people waited its fulfilment until the coming of Jesus Christ. He, the ideal Israelite, fulfilled the prophet's conception in a way of which the prophet had not been able to conceive.

(3) The modern student, then, as he compares the New Testament events with Old Testament predictions, learns that prophecy was probably never intended to be literally fulfilled centuries afterward. Prophecy represents the yearning of noble and inspired hearts—it represents the outgoing of such hearts toward a distant and dimly apprehended ideal. It represents the formation of those yearnings and the conceptions of that ideal in the terms and under the concepts of the prophet's own time. The fulfilment—the fuller coming of the ideal into the world or into human consciousness—especially if its coming is delayed for centuries—is almost sure to be in a form so different from the prophet's picture as hardly to be recognized by those who look for literal fulfilment.

III

That this was the case in the instance of our Saviour may be demonstrated in another way. The evangelists—especially the author of the Gospel of Matthew—believing that Jesus was the Messiah, and holding the magic theory of the power of a prophetic word, lived and wrote after the beginning of a conception of the

relation of prophecy to Jesus and Jesus to prophecy which was in the second century summed up in the dictum: "Nothing happened that was not prophesied, and nothing was prophesied that did not happen." Writing under the influence of such a belief, the author of the Gospel of Matthew was always on the lookout for fulfilments of Old Testament prophecy, but he was hard put to it to find many. Here are some of his most successful efforts: In Matthew 1:22, Isaiah 7:14 is quoted as a prophecy fulfilled by the virgin birth of Jesus. He quotes from the Septuagint version, "A *parthenos* shall conceive and bear a son." "Virgin" is, however, a mistranslation of the Hebrew word *almah,* which meant any young woman, whether married or unmarried. It is also a misunderstanding of the Greek word *parthenos,* which in Homer was still applied to a young married woman (Iliad, Bk. II, 514), and was probably also used in the same way in the Koinē dialect of Egypt, or the translators of the Septuagint would not have translated *almah* by it. In Attic Greek *parthenos* meant an unmarried young woman, and was apparently so employed in the dialect of the Koinē known to the evangelist. It was natural, therefore, that the evangelist should infer that *parthenos* in Isaiah 7:14 referred to a virgin. As already pointed out, the prophet was speaking to King Ahaz of something that would occur within the next few years—something that would have a bearing on the war then pending. Isaiah may have referred to his own wife, or to a wife of Ahaz, or, as most interpreters believe, to some indefinite young woman, but he did not refer to a virgin—it was the woman's faith, not her virginity, that was significant—and he did not refer to the distant future. Matthew found his fulfilment simply because the Septuagint translators happened to translate the Hebrew *almah* for the Greek *parthenos.* The birth of Jesus was not a real fulfilment of the intent of the prophecy.

Again in Matthew 2:15 Matthew says the Holy Family went and sojourned in Egypt that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken by the prophet: "Out of Egypt have I called my son." He is quoting Hosea 11:1; but Hosea, in this passage, was not

prophesying; he was making an historical statement to prove that God was a loving father to Israel. Hosea's words are,

> " When Israel was a child then I loved him,
> And called my son out of Egypt."

There was no prophecy in the words; it was an historical statement referring to the Exodus.

Again, Matthew in 2:18 finds in the slaughter of the Innocents at Bethlehem a fulfilment of Jeremiah 31:15:

> " In Ramah was there a voice heard
> Weeping and great mourning,
> Rachel weeping for her children,
> And refuseth to be comforted because they
> are not."

Jeremiah was not, however, referring to death, but to captivity. And he goes on in verse 16 to say: " Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears . . . . for they shall come again from the land of the enemy."

Again, in Matthew 2:23 the evangelist says that the Holy Family went and dwelt in Nazareth that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken by the prophet, " He shall be called a Nazarene." For such a prophecy one searches the Old Testament in vain. The nearest one can come to anything that looks like it is in Isaiah 11:1:

> " There shall come forth a shoot out of the
> stock of Jesse,
> And a branch (Hebrew, *neser*) out of his roots
> shall bear fruit."

A fulfilment is obtained only by taking the Hebrew word *neser* in a sense not intended.

If space permitted examples might be multiplied. It can only be noted in conclusion that, in order to obtain fulfilments or prophetic foreshadowings the author of this Gospel sometimes changed or added to the words of Jesus himself. Thus in Luke 11:32 Jesus is, we believe, correctly reported as saying: " The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with the men of

this generation and shall condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold a greater than Jonah is here." Jesus employed the allusion on account of the parallel between his preaching and the preaching of Jonah, and on account of the contrast between the penitence of the Ninevites and the impenitence of the men of his generation. Matthew, however, in narrating the incident added a reference to the "sign" of Jonah, and drew a parallel between the three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, and the sojourn of Jesus' body three days and nights in the tomb.

The conclusion to which one is driven by the examination of the kind of fulfilments of prophecy in which this evangelist believed, is that, while such conceptions were in conformity with the unscientific ideas of the first century, they not only cannot stand the test of modern knowledge, but, if perpetuated in modern times, would lead to endless vagaries. This apostolic practice in the interpretation of prophecy is no more binding on a modern man than the Apostolic conception of the flatness of the earth is, and in no way seriously impairs the correctness of the conception of the fulfilment of prophecy set forth above. As already noted, the Apostles did not understand that the apocalyptic expectations of a Messiah who should come on the clouds of heaven and establish an earthly kingdom by violence, were not to be fulfilled. The early Church lived in daily expectation of Christ's bodily return. An apocalypse was embodied in the 13th chapter of the Gospel of Mark and attributed to Jesus; apocalyptic pictures were vividly drawn by St. Paul in 1 Thessalonians 4: 13 ff. and in 2 Thessalonians 2, and the Book of Revelation was filled with them. In his later Epistles (2 Cor., Phil. and Col.) St. Paul shows that he had abandoned the apocalyptic view and had substituted a more spiritual one. The author of the Fourth Gospel, writing at the end of the first century A. D. had also abandoned it. He omits the discourse on the last things (Mk. 13, Matt. 24 & Lu. 21) and substitutes for it the matchless conversations in John 14-16. In these chapters he substitutes the coming of the Holy Spirit for the return of Christ. Notwithstanding this,

the hope of a literal return of Christ pervaded the rank and file of the Church, and because it was not fulfilled caused great anxiety and doubt. This is reflected in the latest book in our canon, the Second Epistle of Peter, written about the middle of the second century A. D. It shows that "mockers" had arisen who said: "Where is the promise of his coming? for from the days that the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation of the world" (2 Pet. 3:4). From that day to this there have been in times of great struggle and distress revivals of millennial hopes. One such has, in consequence of the great war, swept over the world. What a recent writer has called the "apocalyptic mind" revels in such expectations, in calculating the date when the great event may be expected, and in making charts of the future. Others, for whom such things do not possess this fascination, feel compelled to concede the general validity of this point of view, because the plain words of the New Testament seem so often to command its acceptance.

IV

This chapter may well conclude with a demonstration of the futility of this last method of dealing with prophecy drawn from the Bible itself—an illustration that, by clearing the field of opposing views, vindicates the correctness of the sound principle of interpreting prophecy we have already discerned and expressed.

In Daniel 7:25, which was written during the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus IV between 168 and 165 B. C., there occurs the mystic phrase, "three and a half times." It is said that the saints of the Most High shall be delivered into the hand of their oppressor until "a time and times and half a time."

It has been conjectured that the phrase was an old one even then—that it had become traditional. It has been conjectured that it was taken up from the Babylonian Creation Epic, and that originally it referred to the three and a half months between the

SCHOOL OF THEOL

winter solstice and the vernal equinox. Whatever its origin, the author of Daniel 7 employs it as the mystic measure of the time before the coming of the judgment and the establishment of the kingdom of the Most High. It probably was understood by him to mean three years and a half, for in the New Testament Book of Revelation (12:6) it is interpreted as 1260 days—just three years and six months of thirty days each.

Antiochus defiled the Temple for three years. He set up his altar to Zeus on which swine were offered in December, 168 B. C., and the Jews recovered the Temple and cleansed it in December, 165 B. C.—an event that was celebrated yearly to the time of Christ by the Feast of the Dedication (see Jno. 10:22). The recovery of the Temple seemed to warrant the expectation that, at the end of three years and a half, God would intervene and establish His kingdom. The time passed, however, and nothing happened. An editor then added in Daniel 12:11 a note explaining that it was 1290 days—or two years and a half of 12 months each, and an intercalary year of 13 months. This time also passed and the kingdom did not come, so another annotator added in Daniel 12:12 a note that it was to be in 1335 days. Forty-five days were added. This gave two intercalary years and allowed half of an intercalary year on the half year. This time also passed and the kingdom did not come, but apocalyptists did not lose faith in its mystic significance, for it is quoted in Revelation 12:14.

Meantime another way of interpreting ancient numbers had grown up. Jeremiah (ch. 25:11) had said that Israel should serve Babylon 70 years, but when the Book of Daniel was written the Jews were still in Babylonia, where they remained till about 1000-1100 A. D., when the harsh rule of the Seljuk Turks dispersed their colony. The author of Daniel 9 accounted for this by saying that 70 years did not mean just 70 straight years, but 70 weeks of years, i. e., 7 times 70 years or 490 years. Thus he introduced the idea of a week into apocalyptic calculations.

Another turn was given to these interpretations before 2 Peter was written, for its author warns his brethren to remember that "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day" (2 Pet. 3:8). This idea survived in

the Christian Church, and, as the year 1000 A. D. approached, men believed that the end was coming. There was profound suffering all over Europe, caused by wars and the migrations of the Barbarians. The thousand-year day of Christian history—the world's Sabbath—was nearing completion. So sure were men of this that, as the year 1000 approached, many deeded their property to the Church, thinking they would need it no longer. An archaeological friend of mine, the late G. T. Revoira, of Rome, examined some of these deeds. But the year 1000 came and went and the end did not come.

How many such times have, for similar reasons, been set since, I do not know. There was, I know, a day set by the Millerites in October, 1843, and there have been several since. The latest date set so far as I know was December 17, 1919, but that too passed and the world still goes on.

The past is strewn with the wrecks of such prophetic or semi-prophetic schemes. Those drawn up by Biblical writers have been no nearer the truth than those drawn up since.

An inductive study of the subject leads, therefore, to the conclusion that the general function of the prophet is that of the preacher, viz.: to formulate ideals, to perceive as clearly as he can the goal toward which God would lead mankind, and to express those ideals or describe that goal as vividly and powerfully as he can. The prophet was inevitably limited in his portrayal and descriptions to the thoughts and concepts of his time. We may accordingly look for fulfilments to be so much more spiritual, so much more desirable, so much more glorious in the eternal sense of that word, that, when they come, they will probably always appear as fulfilments, not of the details of prophetic words, but of the ideal toward which the prophet was moving. It may safely be assumed that a fulfilment will be in its spiritual significance immeasurably greater than the bit of it that its prophetic herald could grasp.

"It doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall be manifested, we shall be like Him" (1 Jno. 3:2), is descriptive of a sound principle for the interpretation of prophecy—a principle both scientific and Christian.

CHAPTER II

THE PERSON OF CHRIST

I

The starting point for a study of the New Testament conceptions of the Person of Christ is Jesus' own estimate of Himself. In the past the miracles have sometimes been relied upon to prove his extraordinary character, but miracles are told of many religious teachers; some of them quite as extraordinary as those of the Gospels. Back of the Gospel reports, however, stands Jesus Himself, and central in the Person of Jesus is his consciousness of what he was. In spite of a few voices to the contrary, one assured outcome of modern study of the Life of Christ is the established fact that he claimed to be the Messiah. True, Wrede and Nathaniel Schmidt have denied that he thought of himself as more than a prophet, and more recently Case has joined their company; the contrary fact, however, is so ingrained in the warp and woof of the Gospels that to the great majority of students of the New Testament the fact seems incontestable. If we can form some idea of what this claim involved, we shall be in a position to know what Jesus thought of Himself.

There is one phrase which in the Gospels is often on our Lord's lips and which offers hope of an interpretation of his Messianic claim; that is the phrase "Son of Man." That phrase, employed in Daniel 7: 13 in a symbolic sense, had become in the early part of the first century before our era a Messianic title, and is so employed in the Parables of Enoch, which were written by a Pharisee and who employs the phrase fourteen times. In Enoch 48: 2 f. it is said of the Son of Man,

> At that hour that Son of Man was named
> In the presence of the Lord of Spirits,
> And his name before the Head of Days.
> Yea, before the sun and signs were created,
> Before the stars of heaven were made,
> His name was named before the Lord of Spirits.[1]

The religious sympathies of Joseph and Mary were with the Pharisees, and it is probable that the use of the term Son of Man by the author of the Enoch Parables was familiar to our Lord. Indeed, it does not seem too much to assume that its use in that book may have been one of the reasons which led him to adopt it as his own self-designation. The Son of Man was here described as a heavenly Person—a pre-existent being, whose place in heaven and whose future career upon the earth are more glorious than that of any other creature. The natural inference, therefore, is that our Lord found in his own nature depths which in his estimation justified him in assuming this title, and that his Messianic consciousness, accordingly, is evidence that he knew himself to occupy a unique relation to God.

This inference, which the writer not only believes to be justified but to be an impregnable citadel of the Faith, is assaulted from several different sides today. There is:

1. The denial of the validity of the religious consciousness. Psychology has not only, as Professor Osborne observes,[2] lost the soul, but a prominent psychologist has contested the validity of the religious consciousness as a whole. According to him all sense of the presence of God or of relationship to Him is demonstrable illusion. The "mind, great and powerful though it is,"

[1] For other similar expressions, see Enoch, chapters 46 and 51. If it be objected that we have no proof that the Enoch passages were known to our Lord, it is certain that the "one like unto a son of man" of Daniel 7:13 was, for Daniel was a part of the Jewish canon of Scripture. True, in Daniel the term was not originally employed in a Messianic sense, but there is evidence outside of Enoch that it was so interpreted by the Jews by the beginning of the Christian era; cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism* (1927), Vol. II, pp. 334-337.

[2] *Evolution, Education and Religion,* New York, 1926, p. 73 ff. Professor Osborne makes the complaint as a scientist; not as a theologian.

in all such matters " deceives us grievously." [1] The proof offered of this deception is of two kinds: (1) The irrational processes of primitive man's magic are cited as proof of the unreality of religious faith, and (2) in laboratory experiments a blindfolded person has been conscious of a sense of presence, when no one was near. It is accordingly inferred that the sense of Presence—the Divine Presence—which mystics have experienced is also an illusion. The inference is that consciousness in these matters cannot be trusted.

The author of this argument forgets that magic is primitive man's science, not his religion, and that all that he cites on that score tells against the validity of science, including psychology, rather than against the validity of religion. For such scientific absurdities, one does not need to go back to magic; he need only cite some medical practices of a century ago, or even forty years ago! As to the second argument, it is thoroughly unscientific to base a universal conclusion on two or three experiments. Psychologists themselves say that it takes at least a thousand experiments to establish a scientific fact, and even then, in psychology, there may be exceptions. In spite of the innumerable faces now aglow with cosmetics there is such a thing as a flush that comes from health! It will take more than psychology has yet offered to convince sane men that a consciousness of union with God that floods life with new peace, lifts it to unexampled moral and spiritual levels, and fills it with ethical power, is altogether an illusion. Every one is conscious of the limitations of the processes of his mind. He knows that he is often deceived. The processes of the mind may be deranged so that consciousness is not a safe guide. It is always necessary to employ all legitimate tests to be sure that one is in touch with reality, but, when that has been done, we must trust consciousness. If we do not, all science as well as all religion is illusion. The case is analogous to the problem of determinism and free will. One can make a plausible argument

[1] J. H. Leuba, *Atlantic Monthly,* January, 1927, 71-80, and more fully in *The Psychology of Religious Mysticism,* New York, 1925. Leuba has been well answered by Rufus M. Jones in *New Studies in Mystical Religion,* New York, 1927, pp. 9-57 and 173-205.

that there is no such thing as free will, and yet every man knows that he is responsible for his actions. Organized society is built upon that conviction. Similarly men know that the religious consciousness of the best and greatest of our race is to be trusted. Sophistry may for a time confuse some; but now as in the past we may rely upon the consciousness of earth's greatest and best, and of these Jesus Christ stands pre-eminent.

2. Closely related to those who deny the validity of the religious consciousness, but still occupying a somewhat kindred position, is a group of writers who hold that Jesus was a paranoiac.[1] He claimed to be the Messiah, it is true, but such a claim no one in his right mind could make, so the Gospels are ransacked for signs of our Lord's insanity. These writers have been ably answered by more than one scholar.[2] To the mind of the ordinary man, however, no reply is necessary. Such theories condemn themselves. If Jesus of Nazareth was insane, it will be a happy day for humanity when all are attacked by the same madness! The sane sense of the common man trusts, we believe, the consciousness of Jesus, and will continue to trust it even should a whole lunatic asylum of such diagnosticians appear!

The religion of humanity is based on religious consciousness. Just as the radio instrument catches and interprets vibrations wafted from afar, so the best attuned souls of our race have caught and interpreted impulses from the Infinite. Both a telegraphic instrument and a telephone are wonderful instruments, but nevertheless they do not vibrate to the electric waves made vocal by the radio. This lack, however, does not prove the radio an illusion. Those who listen to its voices know whereof they speak. With one of old they can say: "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you." The Master of all the seers of our race is Jesus Christ. His consciousness we can trust; and he knew Himself to be the Jewish Messiah.

[1] As a sample of this class of books we may cite Binet-Sanglé's *La Folie de Jesu,* Paris, 1911 f.

[2] See, for example, Bundy, *The Psychical Health of Jesus,* New York, 1923.

When, however, we ask what that implied, we are met by fresh difficulties. The New Testament scholarship of the last quarter of a century presents no uniform answer. Professors Foakes-Jackson, Lake [1] and Case,[2] recognizing that there were in the Judaism of our Lord's time two conceptions of the Messiah, one which portrayed him as the Son of David (i. e., a human, though heroic, king), and the other as the Son of Man revealed from heaven, claim that, if Jesus regarded Himself as the Messiah, he must have entertained one or the other of these conceptions of Himself. That he could have taken the term and breathed into it a new meaning, apparently they deem impossible. They reason as though it were possible by ascertaining what these terms connoted to writers of apocalyptic to fathom all that was in Jesus' mind. That he could have possessed a grain of originality, they seem by assumption (unless we misunderstand them) to deny. Every great prophet has possessed some degree of originality. Without it he could not have been a prophet. On any theory of our Lord's Person it does him less than justice to assume that he was less than they. His use of the term Son of Man shows that he found in his nature such depths that he felt justified in claiming to be the Messiah in the sense that that phrase connoted. Unless his own words excluded the heavenly implications of Enoch's use of the phrase, we are not justified in denying that he was conscious of possessing more than a human nature. That we can, by studying Enoch and Esdras, ascertain all that he meant by the phrase is an equally unjustified procedure. To " have the mind of Christ " we must study his own words long and lovingly.

[1] See their *Beginnings of Christianity,* Part I, Vol. I, pp. 282, 283.

[2] See his " Alleged Messianic Consciousness of Jesus," *Journal of Biblical Literature,* XLVI, 1927, 1-19 and his *Jesus* (Chicago, 1927), pp. 360-378, especially pp. 370, 371. The assumption that Jesus never used the term " Son of Man," and that it is put into his mouth by the Evangelists is, for the majority of the passages in the Gospels, particularly indefensible; cf. F. C. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings,* London, 1924, pp. 30-35. If Jesus never employed the term, it is impossible to explain why Jesus is represented as applying it to himself, when New Testament writers represent no one else as applying the term to him.

When, however, we go through the Synoptic Gospels to discover in just what sense our Lord regarded Himself as the Messiah we find the task difficult. There are passages that imply that the Kingdom was already present (as Lu. 17:21), and there are others which imply that it was still to come (as Mk. 13:24-27). There are parables, like that of the sower and the silent growth, which teach that the coming of the Kingdom is to be gradual, and there are utterances which imply that it is to be sudden and as cataclysmic as any apocalyptist thought it to be. It is not strange, therefore, that the opinions of scholars are still further divided. Johannes Weiss,[1] Schweitzer,[2] and Warschauer[3] hold Jesus responsible for every apocalyptic utterance in the Gospels, interpret these in their most literal sense, and claim that our Lord was a child of his age, accepted the Jewish theory of the world outlined in the preceding chapter, and claimed to be the Messiah in the apocalyptic sense only. "They conceive of Jesus as provoking the fate which he suffered in Jerusalem in order to achieve that supernal glory of which he read in Daniel and Enoch, a triumph of the supernal Son of Man." Such a Jesus, as Schweitzer admits, could have little in common with the men of our time.

During the past twenty-five years this school of thought has enjoyed great popularity, but it does Jesus scant justice. One scholar who holds it in part admits that our Lord's inner ideals were at war with the principles of the apocalyptic theory.[4] The best and soundest scholarship of our time recognizes that, though Jesus was a first century Jew and shared the thought of his time, he transcended that thought. He claimed to be the Messiah, but he put even into that word a new and more spiritual meaning. He employed sometimes apocalyptic language, but he transmuted it.[5] He put new wine into the old apocalyptic bottles, but the disciples,

[1] *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes,* 1892.

[2] *Ein Skizze des Lebens Jesu,* translated under the title *The Mystery of the Kingdom* and *Von Reimarus zu Wrede,* translated as *The Quest of the Historical Jesus.*

[3] *The Historical Life of Christ,* 1927.

[4] E. F. Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah* and *The Ethics of Jesus.*

[5] So Von Dobschüts, *The Eschatology of the Gospels,* p. 150 f. Cf. also B. W. Bacon, *The Story of Jesus,* New York, 1927, 224 ff.

not always recognizing the new, expanded his words by apocalyptic additions of their own. Jesus claimed to be the Messiah and employed the phrase "Son of Man" to express his claim because he was conscious of a nature and of a unique relation to God and of a mission which these best expressed, but he employed those terms in no slavish manner. With unique creative originality he gave to them new meanings, deeper, higher, more spiritual than they had ever borne before.

For the purpose of our present theme it makes little difference at what period of our Lord's ministry he reached the conviction that he was the Messiah. The fact that his pure, elevated, and penetrating consciousness of what he was justified him in applying to Himself the title is decisive. Whether with Scott and Bosworth we hold that Jesus came to regard Himself as the Messiah, at Cæsarea Philippi, or with the majority of New Testament scholars we believe that he became conscious of his Messiahship at his Baptism, the consciousness of Messiahship would remain, and that consciousness was the starting-point of the New Testament estimates of his Person. It is also the guarantee that those estimates, however they may vary in form, represent a reality. It is clear to one who looks beneath the surface of the Gospels that our Lord's conception of his own Messiahship differed from current Jewish expectations. He came not to establish an empire over men's bodies, but to establish God's rule over human lives and, by so doing, to create a new human society. Nevertheless the fact that he found in the terms Messiah and Son of Man, with their supernatural associations, the best way of describing Himself and his mission is eloquent testimony of what he knew Himself to be.[1] We may wish that he had unveiled his inner life more completely and told us more of its depths and heights, but, after all, what he gave is sufficient.

To imply, however, that our Lord's claim to unique character rests solely on his Messianic consciousness, would be to present a

[1] It is not intended to imply that the questions alluded to above are matters of indifference. The writer's views upon them will be found in his *Jesus of Nazareth, a Biography,* Macmillan, 1922, chapters XV and XVI, and pp. 132 f., 148 f., chapter XLVII and p. 368.

distorted picture. Equally remarkable was his moral consciousness. Of all earth's great teachers, he alone evinced a consciousness of complete moral union with God, and devotion to the Father's will. He also with unerring insight discerned the heart of every ethical situation at which he looked and in his teaching approaches most nearly the expression of an absolute ethic. Although he wrote nothing, his ethical teaching dominates every account of his life. So unique, consistent, and compelling was his ethical teaching that it shines through every Gospel, through every document underlying the Gospels,[1] and even through those few sayings which Professor Schmiedel calls "pillar passages," because they are so contrary to the preconceived notions of the time that they could not have been invented. From what a Person—from what an ethical consciousness—must that teaching have come that could originate an ethic of such a quality that no report could dim it and no reporter altogether misunderstand it!

This ethical uniqueness of Jesus has been sometimes denied. It has been said that ethically he uttered nothing new; that all his teaching can be found in the Old Testament or in the Jewish Rabbis. In a sense this is true. In scattered sayings here and there gems of teaching may by labor be discovered in the Jewish Bible, Talmud, and Midrashim which parallel most of the sayings of Jesus. These are indeed there, but how much more also! They are like scattered grains of wheat in stacks of chaff. Much must be conceded to the genius of One who could with unerring instinct gather the wheat together and leave the chaff. Klausner, however, himself an ardent Jew, rightly declares:[2] "But there is a new thing in the Gospels. . . . . Jesus gathered together and, so to speak, condensed and concentrated ethical teachings in such fashion as to make them more prominent than in *Talmudic Haggada* and *Midrashim,* where they are interspersed among more commonplace discussions and worthless matter." Klausner further says[3] that Jesus "annulled Judaism as the life-force of the Jewish nation. For a religion which possesses only a certain concep-

[1] This fact is finely set forth in H. C. King's *Ethics of Jesus.*
[2] *Jesus of Nazareth, his Times, his Life, and his Teachings,* 389.
[3] *Ibid.,* 390.

tion of God and a morality acceptable to *all* mankind, does not belong to any special nation, and, consciously or unconsciously, breaks down the barriers of nationality." The moral consciousness of Jesus and his moral and spiritual sanity attest the trustworthiness of his Messianic consciousness.

II

The communication by Jesus to his disciples at Cæsarea Philippi that he was the Messiah raised in them great expectations. Visions of Israel wielding world-wide empire rose in their minds, only to be dashed in a little while by the tragedy of Calvary. The experiences of the first Easter, however, soon changed their despair into triumphant confidence, and they began to proclaim to their Jewish brethren and then to the world that Jesus was the Christ, the Messiah. This one fact penetrated their minds and remained fixed. The spiritual nature of the kingdom as taught by Jesus they in no way understood. He was the Messiah. Messiah meant to them a king. Some of their apocalypses had spoken of the Messiah as to be revealed from heaven;[1] so they inferred that Jesus had ascended only to return in God's good time to establish his kingdom on the earth. This is the substance of the early Apostolic preaching in the Acts of the Apostles; it constituted an important part of the preaching of St. Paul during the first twenty years of his ministry and formed the main theme of his earliest Epistles—those to the Thessalonians. Jesus was the Messiah. He was in his Person all that apocalyptists had declared the Messiah to be. Christ is the Son of God, says St. Paul (1 Thes. 1:10 & 2 Thes. 2:1), and is associated with the Father in the administration of Divine Providence (1 Thes. 3:17). Christ has ascended to heaven, and it is the chief business of the believer to await his return (1 Thes. 1:9, 10). When he comes he will destroy the

[1] E. g., *Apocalypse of Baruch*, 30:1.

wicked by the breath of his mouth (2 Thes. 2:8). That was the sum and substance of the Church's Christology during the first quarter of a century of Christian life. St. Paul was, however, finally led to seek other definitions of Christ's Person.

The influences which led St. Paul to broaden and deepen his view of our Lord's Person came from Greece. The Jewish philosophy of history which underlay apocalyptic and which gave form to the earliest Christian preaching made no appeal to the Greeks. Six hundred years of philosophy in a country which had given birth to Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, had created an attitude of mind toward life and the universe which found little that was congenial in apocalyptic expectations. The ordinary Greek might not be a philosopher, but he admired wisdom and was not attracted by Jewish materialistic theories. The whole Messianic conception, which meant so much to Jews, was as foreign to the Greek as the Hindu metempsychosis and doctrine of *Karma* is to us. In commending Christ to such a people, St. Paul naturally fell back upon a thought which had been developed in the Wisdom books of the Old Testament and Apocrypha—the Wisdom of God. In Job,[1] Proverbs,[2] Ecclesiasticus,[3] and the Wisdom of Solomon,[4] wisdom had been praised and personified. Some of these books had developed in the Diaspora and under Greek influence. In Proverbs 8:22-31 Wisdom is personified as an architect that stood by God's side at creation and helped him lay the foundations of the earth. In the Wisdom of Solomon 7:22-30, Wisdom is not only called an artificer, but is said to be "a breath of the power of God, and a clear effulgence of the glory of the Almighty." St. Paul accordingly declared (1 Cor. 1:30) that "Christ Jesus . . . . was made unto us Wisdom from God."

In another New Testament writer this thought found equally early expression. Indeed, it is possible that the identification of Christ goes back to our Lord Himself. In Matthew 11:28-30

[1] Job, chapter 28.
[2] Proverbs, chapter 8.
[3] Ecclesiasticus, chapter 24.
[4] Wisdom of Solomon, chapter 7.

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

Christ is represented as speaking as in the Wisdom Books Wisdom speaks. "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light." In similar strain Wisdom is frequently represented as speaking (see Prov. 1:20 & 2:12). These words of our Lord follow a passage which demonstrably belongs to the document which scholars call Q, and are, in all probability, a part of that same source—one of the oldest sources underlying the Gospels. Either the author of the source originated the representation of Christ speaking in the guise of Wisdom (in which case the idea is as old as the Epistle to the Corinthians), or, as the present writer has long believed,[1] the words are genuine words of Jesus, and he blazed the way for the identification of Himself with the Wisdom of God.

Wisdom was not, however, the only figure by which St. Paul presented Christ to the Corinthians. He declared Christ to be "the image (εἰκὼν) of God" (2 Cor. 4:4) and the mirror in which we with unveiled face see God reflected (2 Cor. 3:18). Both to the Corinthians and the Romans he presented Christ as the perfect man, the second head of the race, typical of the new super-man that is to be, just as Adam was typical of the imperfect man that now is (1 Cor. 15:45-49 & Rom. 5:12-21). It may be said with justice that none of these portrayals of Christ go beyond conceptions that were involved in the pictures of the person and rôle of the Jewish Messiah. While that is true, St. Paul's portrayal of his Master in the second group of his Epistles is more varied, more detailed, and more appealing than in the first group.

It is, however, in the third group of his Epistles that we find St. Paul's ripest thought as to the Person of Christ. Its most detailed expression is found in Philippians 2:5-11 f., a passage in which St. Paul combines a description of how the pre-existent Messiah came to earth with his favorite contrast of Christ with Adam. Adam was made in the image of God (Gen. 1:26). In

[1] Compare "The Mysticism of Jesus" in *At One with the Invisible*, edited by E. Hershey Sneath, Macmillan, 1920, pp. 73-76.

Paradise the temptation was presented to him to "be as God" (Gen. 3:5 RV). At this Adam grasped and as a punishment was expelled from Eden. To St. Paul Christ was the pre-existent Messiah. He started on a different plane from Adam. Previously, as we have noted, he had declared that Christ was the image (εἰκὼν) of God, but here he avoids that term because the Greek translators of Genesis had, in translating by it the Hebrew *ṣelem* of Genesis 1:26, applied it to Adam. So St. Paul says that Christ "being in the form (μορφῇ) of God, thought it not a prize to be grasped at (ἁρπαγμὸν) to be equal with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant. And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient until death, the death of the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted him and gave to him the name that is above every name . . . . that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is LORD (κύριος), to the glory of God the Father."

In this passage the contrast between Adam and Christ is complete. The one grasps at equality with God and is driven from God's presence; the other, though more like God at the start, first empties himself of his Divine form so as to take human shape, and then further obeys God's will up to and including the most painful and disgraceful death. Because of these two choices—these two acts of self-abnegation, says St. Paul, God highly exalted him; he not only gave him back his Divine form, but gave him the NAME that is above every name—the NAME, LORD. Lord (*adōnai*), of which κύριος is the Greek translation, is the word which long had been substituted for the name YHWH in reading the Hebrew Bible, YHWH being regarded as too sacred to be pronounced.[1] This NAME was sacred because it was believed to sum up in itself the attributes of God. By employing, therefore, the word which had become the substitute for this name St. Paul was saying as emphatically as a Jew could that God had given Christ that which he had denied to Adam, equality with himself. In no

[1] How sacred the name YHWH was to a Hebrew may be gathered from Leviticus 24:11 ff., where it is said that the son of an Israelitish mother who blasphemed the NAME was stoned without the camp.

other way could he have expressed more strongly his belief in our Lord's Divinity.

This passage makes it clear that to St. Paul, as to thinking men generally, it did not seem possible for the Godhead to be expressed fully in a human life. Christ emptied Himself of something before he took human form. His life on earth was for him a life of eclipse. "Though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor" (2 Cor. 8:9). Because of his unselfish choices, however, one of which St. Paul believed was made before the Incarnation, and the other while on earth, God not only gave him back his Divinity, but gave him the NAME that is above every name. Perhaps it would be pressing St. Paul's words further than he would himself have done to see in them a statement that after his earthly career our Lord was more nearly on an equality than before, but his language is open to that construction.

A study of Philippians prepares one for what St. Paul says of Christ in his Epistle to the Colossians. At Colossæ a form of gnosticism had appeared. One of its tenets was that God is too pure to come into contact with corrupt matter—that there is a series of intermediaries between him and the world. Such a view struck at the heart of Christianity. If it were true, there could have been no Incarnation; God is too pure ever to have dwelt in flesh. Gnosticism was the negation of salvation by faith. The soul of man, caught in the meshes of corrupt matter, must by knowledge and ascetic practices work out its own salvation. By knowing how it got in, it could thread the labyrinth backward and work its way out.

To the Apostle of salvation by faith, this was the negation of the Gospel. In this epistle he sets himself so to present Christ as to cut the ground from beneath the feet of the gnostic teachers. He tells them that in Christ "dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. 2:9), that by Christ (for so we should translate ἐν with the dative) all things were created, things in heaven and upon earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions, and that he is before all things, and in him all things consist or hold together (Col. 1:16, 17). In this presentation the gnostic

theory was squarely met. It was declared that God in his fulness dwelt in the Messiah; God had not therefore hesitated to dwell in human flesh. Further, God had through the agency of the pre-existent Christ created all things. There was accordingly no need for intermediate beings. The gnostics were fond of abstract terms. Their *syzygies* or pairs of intermediate beings were made up of such abstractions—*logos* or " word," *sophia* or " wisdom," *bathus* or " depth," *pleroma* or " fulness," etc. St. Paul says to the Colossians in substance, if you want a *pleroma,* you have it in Christ, for it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell (Col. 1 : 19).

In declaring that the universe was called into being through the agency of the pre-existent Christ, St. Paul anticipated the substance of the Logos-doctrine of the Fourth Gospel, but without employing the term *logos*. When he says that in Christ all things consist, or hold together, he is in substance saying that Christ is the immanent world-soul. It is a conception which, if rigidly applied, would abolish the idea of a Messiah who had gone away and was at sometime to return in a cataclysm. How could the world-soul ever get far enough away to need to return? There are a number of other indications that during the last ten years of his life St. Paul abandoned the apocalyptic world-theory. Like others who make radical changes of thought comparatively late in life, though, he never altogether gave up the vocabulary that was called into being by the apocalyptic theory and which he had employed for so many years.

St. Paul's statement " in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily " might at first sight seem to contradict his statement in Philippians that, to become man Christ emptied himself. The verb " dwelleth " (κατοικεῖ) is, however, in the present tense. St. Paul was thinking of the ascended Christ, or Christ in his post-resurrection state as the Soul of the universe. When this is recognized his statements in the two Epistles are seen to be in perfect accord. The fulness of the Godhead belongs to the period after the NAME which is above every name had been given to him. Thus St. Paul, starting from the Messianic conceptions held in

EVANGELICAL SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

those circles which originated the Jewish apocalypses, in interpreting Christ to Greeks and in combating gnosticism, worked his way to a theory of the nature and functions of his Master that is practically identical with that set forth in the Fourth Gospel.

III

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who had come under the influence of Philo as well as under that of St. Paul, held substantially the same view, but he expressed it in his own original way. He declares that God, at the end of the days, has spoken unto us by "a Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the worlds; who, being the effulgence of his glory and the very image (χαρακτὴρ) of his substance (ὑποστάσεως), and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had made purification of sins, sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high" (Heb. 1:2, 3). In these words we have expressed the same conceptions as those in Philippians and Colossians. Christ is the very image of the Divine essence or *hypostasis*. All things were created by him and by the word of his power he upholds all things. He is an efficient priest because of the power of his endless life (7:16). This, too, is the Logos-doctrine without the use of the word *logos*.

During this time the Christian estimate of Christ found expression in another way. At the beginning of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke stand two accounts of his birth from a virgin. Whether with the majority of Christians we regard these beautiful idyls as history or with a growing number of devout Christians we deem them early Christian attempts to account for our Lord's remarkable Personality, they are certainly a tribute to the extraordinary impression that that Personality made upon the people of the first century who came under its spell, for the history, if it be history, would never have been told, had not his life,

character, transforming power, and abiding influence prepared the way for its reception. As Warschauer says:[1] "What must have been the quality of a Life to which such an origin was attributed? They are trustworthy testimonies . . . . to the quality and magnitude of Jesus' character."

While the thought of St. Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was travelling away from the strictly eschatological conception of the Messiah as embodied in the apocalyptic literature, a large section of the Church clung to the original views. In these circles the Gospels were written. In St. Mark there was incorporated a little apocalypse written in the reign of Caligula and attributed to Jesus.[2] In St. Luke (ch. 21) and St. Matthew (ch. 24) the chapter which St. Mark had thus constructed was further expanded by the addition of other eschatological material which further stamped the thought of Jesus as identical with that of the apocalyptists. The climax of this type of thought is, however, found in the Book of Revelation.

IV

The Book of Revelation has within the last forty years undergone a searching criticism. Its study has been approached from many points of view and has given rise to a large literature. In spite of differences of opinion which still prevail, and in spite of the unity of plan of the book in its present form, it seems clear that the book contains material from three clearly datable periods, the reign of Caligula, 39-41 A. D. (ch. 13: 14-16), the period after the death of Nero (ch. 17: 10), and from the reign of Domitian (ch. 1-3). It is witness to the fact that all through the first century from the Resurrection onward devout persons, possessed of the apocalyptic mind, were brooding and seeing visions. In all

[1] J. Warschauer, *The Historical Life of Christ*, 1927. p. 26.

[2] See St. Mark, chapter 13, and compare the writer's *Jesus of Nazareth*, pp. 340, 341.

these visions Christ is the central figure. In the great scene in chapters 4 and 5, where the throne of God is set above a sea of glass, which is simply the upper side of Ezekiel's firmament of crystal (Eze. 1:22), the four living creatures and the four and twenty elders proclaim the Lamb (a name for Christ) as the One alone able and worthy to break the seals and to unlock the mysteries of the future.

In chapter 12, in words which cannot have been originally written of the birth of the historical Jesus, the birth of the Messiah is described from a woman "arrayed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." Though the imagery was originally taken from some mythical or half-mythical source, doubtless it was placed in the Apocalypse to convey the writer's conception of the exalted character of our Lord.

Again in chapter 19:11-16 the coming of the Messiah to destroy the wicked is portrayed. He rides a white horse, his eyes are a flame of fire, upon his head are many diadems, his name is Faithful and True, yet he has a secret name which no one but himself knows. He is arrayed in a garment sprinkled with blood and has also a name The-Word-of-God. Another name which he bears is King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

With reference to this passage two observations should be made. The Word (λόγος) of verse 13 has nothing to do with the Word (λόγος) of the Fourth Gospel, though it has often been mistaken for it. This is rather the Word as employed in the description of the destruction of the first-born of the Egyptians in the Wisdom of Solomon 18:14 ff., where it is said: "While all things were clothed in deep silence, and night was in the midst of her swift course, thine almighty Word leaped down from heaven from the royal throne like a fierce warrior in the midst of the doomed land, bearing as a sharp sword thine unfeigned commandment; it stood and filled all things with death; it touched heaven and planted itself on earth." This is the same Word which in Revelation goes forth to kill and to make war. It has nothing in common with the creative Word by which the worlds were made,

except that both proceed from God, and that by different writers, and to represent different functions, both are applied to Christ.

The other phrase, King of Kings and Lords of Lords (originally *shar sharrani ù bêl bêli*) takes us far back into Asiatic history. Assyria's kings, proud at having compelled many mighty sovereigns to pay them tribute, coined the phrase. Persian monarchs, whose empire far outstripped anything over which an Assyrian ever ruled, could find no more appropriate terms in which to boast of their supreme dominion. Passed on by Macedonian and Parthian, it is here taken up and pressed into service to give a faint idea of the power and the glory to which the once humble Nazarene, now the exalted and glorified Messiah, is destined.

Another stratum of the Apocalypse, the apocalypse of the Epistles (Rev. 1-3) expresses in still another way its conception of the deity of Christ. It is a natural psychological impulse to represent God as an old man, since he is eternal. Thus in Daniel 7:9 God is called " one that was ancient of days " whose hair was " like pure wool." The same thought is expressed in Enoch 46:1 & 48:1 by calling God a " Head of Days," whose hair was " like wool." In Revelation 1 the seer beholds in vision one " whose hair was white as wool." This one soon identifies himself not only as God but as the exalted Jesus by saying, " I am the first and the last, and the Living One; and I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of death and Hades." Thus the seer of Revelation attributes to the risen Christ features which, in older apocalypses, had been reserved for God. He accordingly declares as emphatically as St. Paul, though in a different way, his belief in the deity of our Lord. It thus appears that, in those circles of Christians whose thought remained to a good degree unchanged by Greek philosophy, an endeavor to express appreciation of the unique character of Christ advanced in the ascription to him of Divine honors *pari passu* with the thought of St. Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Fourth Gospel.

V

The real heir of St. Paul is, however, the author of the Fourth Gospel. From him we have two compositions: The Gospel of St. John and the First Epistle of St. John. Both these works were called forth in part by the author's effort to combat gnosticism—a gnosticism which denied the reality of the Incarnation—but they approach the problem from opposite ends. The thesis of the Epistle is that Jesus is the Christ—that in the human Jesus one sees the Divine Christ. The thesis of the Gospel is that Christ was Jesus—the pre-existent Word (λόγος) became flesh in the human Jesus and tabernacled among us. In the Epistle this is stated on the authority of the author's own experience of Christ (ch. 1 : 2, 3) and readers are invited to prove it by their own experience (ch. 1 : 6, 7; 2 : 27; 4 : 1-3).

In the Gospel, however, he approaches the problem in a different way. He takes up St. Paul's thought as expressed in the Epistle to the Colossians, which had also been adopted by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and develops it. He applies to the pre-existent Messiah the term Word (λόγος), which he declares was in the beginning with God and which was itself divine (θεός, belonging to the God-order; not ὁ θεός, the One Absolute God). Through this Word the universe was made. Apart from him nothing was made of all that was made. This Word became flesh (σάρξ) and tabernacled in Jesus among us (Jno. 1 : 1-14).

In his use of the term *Logos* (Word) the author displays marked originality. It has sometimes been held that this writer's use of the term can be accounted for by the use of *memra,* a term employed for the "word of God" in Palestinian and Babylonian Judaism. It has, however, recently been convincingly shown that *memra* is never used in Jewish writings as the author of this Gospel employs the *Logos*. *Memra* never translates the Hebrew personified word of the Lord (*davar*), it never represents God Himself, it is never immanent in the world. It is employed on the other hand mainly to cover up the fact that in certain Old Testa-

ment narratives the Divine Presence was said to have been actually among men.[1] It was used more to throw dust in the eyes and cover up difficulties than to explain them.

The word *Logos* had been introduced into philosophical terminology by Heraclitus, and had been employed by the Stoics to denote the divine Reason, immanent in the world. From the Stoics it had been borrowed by the Jewish philosopher Philo, who employed it in a very different sense than the Stoics because he had a very different conception of deity. To Philo God was pure Being—an abstract static Unity—pure immaterial intellect—a transcendant, inactive Deity like that of the Neo-Platonists. To Philo the Logos was a kind of secondary God—the manifest and active Deity. While the author of the Fourth Gospel employs the term *Logos,* he does not use it in the Philonic sense, for he believed in a very different God from Philo. Like the writers of the Old Testament, his God is a "live God." "My Father worketh until now" (Jno. 5:18) expressed his conception of God. St. John's *Logos* is not the earthly representative of an inactive Deity. He is of the same class as Deity and he becomes incarnate in man. He through whom God made the world became a tenant of a human body. He was distinct from the Father, and yet so like him that the incarnate *Logos* could say "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (Jno. 14:9); in will he was so identical with God that he could say, "I and the Father are one" (Jno. 10:30). Thus this writer used the term Word, not like the Rabbis, to obscure a problem, not like Philo, to allow a transcendant God to remain inactive, but to convict gnosticism by showing how an active, live, holy God had actually in history come into vital contact with matter and tabernacled in a human body.

Throughout the Gospel the writer portrays Jesus as possessing this exalted character. He is so Divine that he does not receive the Spirit as a dove at his baptism for his own sake, but as a sign to John the Baptist (Jno. 1:32, 33); he has power over nature to turn water into wine and to raise the dead (Jno. 2

[1] See G. F. Moore in the *Harvard Theological Review,* XV (1922), 41-61, and his *Judaism,* 1927, I, 417-419.

& 11); he does not need to thank God, but does it for the benefit of the people (Jno. 11:42); he does not need that any should testify of man, for he knows what is in man (Jno. 2:25); he is not put to death, but lays down his life of himself; he is not raised by the Father, but Himself takes his life again (Jno. 10:17, 18). So throughout the Gospel the Christ moves and acts and speaks as God among men.

VI

The sketch of New Testament thought which we have now made makes it clear that from the Resurrection onward Jesus was recognized as the Messiah and that as the Messiah he was thought of as a heavenly Being closely associated with God. As time advanced he was more and more closely associated with God. This was as true of believers in apocalypse as of those who had outgrown apocalyptic. Did any of these actually call Jesus God? This is an interesting inquiry and can be answered only by the examination of certain passages in the New Testament writings.

How, for example, are we to read Romans 9:5? If with the text of the Revised Version we place a comma after "flesh" (*σάρκα*, in the Greek text) the passage reads: "whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen," and St. Paul declares Christ to be "God over all." If, however, we punctuate with a period after "flesh" we shall translate with the margin of the Revised Version: "of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh. He who is over all is God, blessed forever. Amen." Some editors of the Greek Testament punctuate the passage one way, and some the other. In favor of making a full stop after "flesh" and regarding the last clause as a doxology, is the fact that St. Paul often throws doxologies into the midst of his Epistles, especially when his feelings are deeply stirred. Examples of this may be found in

Romans 11:36; 15:33; 16:20; 1 Thessalonians 3:11-13. Against so punctuating here, is the fact that the doxologies so thrown into the midst of an Epistle's subject-matter all differ from this one. However, that is not decisive, since they all differ from one another.

Again in 1 Timothy 3:16 the Authorized Version, following the later manuscripts, reads, "God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels," etc., while the Revised Version, following earlier texts gives us: "He who was manifested in the flesh," etc., not using the word "God" at all. In this passage the case is very clear. Students of the text of the New Testament are fairly unanimous in the belief that the original reading was the Greek relative pronoun ὅς, which was afterward confused with an abbreviation for the word "God" θεό(ς).

In Titus 2:13 we read: "looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." There are two ways in which these words may be construed. It is possible to understand the words "great God" as descriptive of Jesus Christ just as the word "Saviour" is, or it is possible that the word "our" which is expressed before "great God" is to be understood also before the word "Saviour." In the last mentioned case the meaning would be: "looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ." If this is the sense of the passage Jesus is associated with God, but is not called "God."

In John 1:1 the word "God" (θεός) lacks the article, and, as already pointed out, signifies "Divine" rather than God. In John 1:18, however, there is a difference of reading in the manuscripts, some giving us, as in the text of the Revised Version: "the only begotten Son"; others, as in the margin: "God only begotten." The evidence for the two readings is very evenly balanced; it is hard to decide between them. It can, however, be said that the word "only begotten" (it is one word in the Greek) naturally carries with it the word "Son." No such doubt seems to attach, however, to John 20:28, where St. Thomas, when convinced of the Resurrection, exclaims: "My Lord and my God"

(ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μο). It can hardly be urged that this was a pious ejaculation addressed to God. The context makes it clear that it is confession, that it is really Christ who has appeared in the Disciples' midst and has spoken to him. In this one instance there is no doubt but that the word "God" is applied to Christ.

VII

We have now passed in rapid review the main features of the New Testament conceptions of the Person of Christ. We have seen how inevitably, in consequence of our Lord's Messianic claim, he was by the first believers necessarily thought to be a heavenly Being closely associated with God. We have also seen how in different ways two schools of thought, those who held to the apocalyptic theory of history and those who discarded it, each came to call Christ God; the one by applying to him descriptive words used of God in the Old Testament, the other by actually applying to him the word "God." The writer who employed the last mentioned term used also another—the term *Logos* or Word—a term which powerfully influenced later theological thought and helped to shape the Nicene Creed. The thought of this writer survived because he spoke to the Hellenic mind in its own tongue. It is not an accident that they called him ὁ θεολόγος, "the divine," i. e., "the theologian," for he first and most profoundly interpreted the Person of our Lord to the Greek mind.

Both the philosophy which underlay Jewish apocalyptic and the Græco-Jewish philosophy of the Fourth Gospel have, however, passed away. While perhaps our age can be said to possess no prevailing philosophy, nevertheless we live in a very different world. To many a modern man the *Logos*-philosophy seems unreal, and the picture of Christ as given in the Fourth Gospel seems so to distort historical perspective that, beautiful as it is, it too seems unreal.

It should, however, be remembered that all the writers of the New Testament, including the author of the Fourth Gospel, each in his own way, sought to understand and to interpret the reality that was in the Person of Christ and which had given Jesus his consciousness of Messiahship. Each was compelled to work with the implements with which his age and education equipped him. These men were not spinning figments of the imagination or indulging in barren metaphysics; they were seeking to understand that Reality which had manifested itself in the consciousness of Jesus and to relate that Reality to the universe as they understood it. Christ Himself was also a first century Jew. He lived in the Jewish intellectual environment of that time; its thought he shared, while he transcended it. He in part interpreted that unique relationship to God of which he was conscious, and of which his life was such eloquent testimony, in terms of the thought of his age or he would not have called Himself the Messiah. St. Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel endeavored to interpret the meaning of Messiahship in greater detail, but still the Reality underlay all their thought. They sought to keep that Reality related to the universe as the universe was understood by men to whom the Jewish apocalyptic theory of the universe had become unreal. One who finds their metaphysics unsatisfactory and seeks to interpret the Person of our Master by the postulates of later philosophies will in so far empty Christianity of its meaning as he fails to do full justice to Jesus Christ's consciousness of Sonship with God. The problem of the Christian theologian and preacher of the present day is to relate the Reality, of which Christ was conscious, to the universe as now understood, and so to proclaim it that men shall find it real and experience its significance for life.

CHAPTER III

GOD

I

Jesus Christ, the Founder of Christianity, was a member of the Jewish race; his ministry was expended upon Jews. Christianity, when fully developed, held the Trinitarian view of God; Judaism was and is Unitarian. It becomes, therefore, an interesting study to ascertain how, since Christianity sprang from Jewish soil, its doctrine of God came to be so different. In order to do this, it will be necessary first to refresh our minds as to what the Jewish conceptions of God actually were at the beginning of the Christian era.

Israel's great prophets had taught monotheism. Amos and Isaiah had made it a practical assumption by teaching that Yahweh, Israel's God, ruled all nations. Jeremiah had given it a semi-philosophical expression by declaring that heathen deities were figments of the imagination (Jer. 14:22). The misfortunes of the Exile and the disappointments of succeeding centuries had sifted the nation and transformed it into a Church, the main tenet of which was the soleness or aloneness of Yahweh as the God of the world. Hosea and Isaiah had thought of Yahweh as caring chiefly for Israel and as dealing with other nations mainly as instruments for the education of Israel, but the Second Isaiah took a broader view. He taught that it was God's purpose to save the world and that he had chosen Abraham that through Israel he might reach the world. Election meant not privilege, but service. In the centuries which followed both views survived. In the eighth century God had been thought of as caring mainly for the nation; the individual counted for little, but as time went on God came to be thought of as a Father (Isa. 63:16), and as One to whom

all sorts and conditions of men could appeal, and as One who would help them in their individual needs (see, e. g., Ps. 107). Many of the Psalms set forth the intimate relation of God to animate and inanimate nature. God was regarded as ethical, just, kind, and forgiving.

In the earlier and cruder literature of the Old Testament God had been represented as near and familiar; he sometimes appeared to men in human form (Gen. 18 & Jud. 13), or made known to men his will in dreams. As time went on, however, and God became more exalted in Israel's thought, he was thought of as more and more remote. In the Priestly Document he is majestic, but far away. After the Exile there were a few minor prophets, and then prophecy utterly died out (see Zech. 13:3) and apocalyptic took its place. God had once spoken, but now he was silent. The age of revelation had passed; the age of Rabbinical interpretation and comment began.

During all this time Hebrews thought of God as the living (or live, active) God who ruled the world. If he were remote, he must have some method of conveying to men his will and of accomplishing in nature his purposes. So in the time after the Exile the Jews came more and more to believe in angels as God's messengers. Angels acted as intermediaries between God and men and at times were believed to execute on the inanimate world God's commands. To some it seemed that God came into closer relation with the world than this would imply, so, as noted in the previous chapter, wisdom and God's word were at times personified and represented as acting in the world. Thus in Isaiah 55:11 God's word is said to be sent on a mission which it will accomplish before returning to him. Similarly in Psalm 107:20 God, it is said, " sendeth his word, and healeth them." His word is so personified as to be sent on a mission of healing. Wisdom and the Divine Word, therefore, were by some thought to be manifestations of the far-away and exalted God.

In Palestine and Babylonia the Jews thought of God as a Person; indeed, as a large Man. One Jew, Philo of Alexandria, as already pointed out, thought of God as pure, inactive Being.

This was the result of Philo's contact with Greek philosophy. To Philo it became necessary, therefore, that there should be some active intermediary between this pure Being and the world; he accordingly came to think of the Word (Logos) as a kind of secondary deity. We have no evidence that any other Jew went quite as far as this, but the personification of Wisdom and the Divine Word in the Second Isaiah, the Psalms and in Proverbs shows that Palestinian Jews felt the need of some way by which the far-away and eternal Deity could be thought to act upon the world without abandoning his remoteness and his exaltation.

The author of the Wisdom of Solomon, not only employed personified Wisdom as God's intermediary between Himself and the world, but identified this Wisdom with God's Spirit. In the Old Testament the Spirit had been employed in a vague way. Man had a spirit, so God was also thought to have one. It was through man's spirit or inner life that he made his influence felt upon his fellows; so it was thought that it was God's Spirit that, acting on the spirit of man, enabled man to feel God's influence. This Spirit of God, the author of Wisdom declared (Wisd. of Sol. 1:7) "has filled the world, and that which holdeth all things together hath knowledge of every voice." Thus we find the Spirit of God personified, God's omnipresence asserted, and also his omniscience. But the author of Wisdom had come under Greek influence.

Belief in the omnipresence and the omniscience of God was not, however, the sole possession of the Dispersion. A Palestinian Jew, the author of the 139th Psalm, had strongly asserted both:

> "Thou knowest my downsitting and uprising;
> Thou understandest my thought afar off.
> Thou searchest out my path and my lying down,
> And art acquainted with all my ways.
> For there is not a word in my tongue,
> But, lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether.
> . . . . . .
> Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?
> Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?
> If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there:
> If I make my bed in Sheol, behold, thou art there.

If I take the wings of the morning,
And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;
Even there shall thy hand lead me,
And thy right hand shall hold me."

Thus the best Jewish thought, both within and without Palestine, had reached a sublime and inspiring conception of God.

II

Into the less philosophical portion of this circle of Jewish thought Jesus was born. What did he think of God? How did his thought of the Father differ from that of his Jewish brethren? Because he lived the life of a Galilean peasant, spoke in terms which peasants could understand, and chose as his disciples Galilean fishermen, it is easy to misunderstand him. One writer declares "Jesus' idea of God indeed is quite naïve and anthropomorphic." [1] Our Lord fortunately did not speak as a philosopher, but in terms the humblest could understand. His own experience of the nearness and Personality of God was most intense, and he sought to lead others to a vivid consciousness of God's nearness and to a genuine experience of his Fatherhood. This could not be done by philosophical definitions, even had our Master been incarnate as a philosopher.

The new element in Jesus' thought of God was in a way not new; it was only new because he raised it to the *n*th degree and made it paramount. A difference in degree carried far enough becomes a difference in kind. He thought of God as a Father who is so loving that his tender care goes out to the meanest of his creatures. That Hebrews had long thought of God as Father has already been pointed out, but few realize what an array of passages in the Old Testament, Apocrypha, and in Rabbinical literature can

[1] A. C. McGiffert, *The God of the Early Christians*, p. 4.

be cited to reinforce the thought.[1] As one passes from this literature to the Synoptic Gospels, however, he notes a difference. Much of the phraseology is the same, but there is a difference of atmosphere—of intensity. It is one thing to think of a Father who is majestic and terrible, and another to believe in a Father who so cares for his children that they can trust him for all life's common needs. It is one thing to refrain from things we wish to do because our Father has laid upon us prohibitions, as a noted Rabbi did, and another, to think of God as a Father who says: "Son, thou art ever with me and all that I have is thine." In the Old Testament God is thought of as the Father of the nation Israel (Hos. 11:1). Later, Jews thought of him as having to the individual the attitude of a Father. But, however genuine the Fatherhood, the Father is afar off in heaven.

Jesus was conscious of God's Fatherhood in an intense personal way. There was at his Baptism that voice—that mystic inrush into his consciousness—"Thou art my Son." Also on another occasion we are told that he experienced a fresh inrush of that consciousness: "In that same hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit and said, I thank Thee, O Father. . . . . All things have been delivered unto me of my Father" (Lu. 10:21, 22 & Matt. 11:25, 27). How many other experiences of this kind he had that are unrecorded we do not know.

From the vantage point of his own experience of God's Fatherhood he speaks of God as the Father of mankind. It is the supreme thought of the Sermon on the Mount. God, just, kind, perfect, exalted far above the petty grudges and passions of men, provides for his children, knowing what they need without being asked. Men are not to worry, but trust their Father; they are not to be mean and revengeful, but, be like their Father and act like him. God so cares for every one that he knows the number of the hairs of each head. His kindness extends to all creatures. "Not a sparrow falls to the ground without your Father" (Matt. 10:29). Of Jesus' conception of the Fatherhood and love of God

[1] The impressive collection of passages in G. F. Moore's *Judaism*, Vol. II, pp. 201-211, should be read. The chapter is entitled "The Father in Heaven."

it has been truly said: "It was the profound spiritual instinct of Jesus which led him to make it the central point of his theistic teaching. He discerned its dominant relation to other sides of the conception of God; he infused into it the warmth and coloring of human feeling and practicalness of every-day life, and therefore he is to be regarded in a true sense as its author." [1]

The Father whom Jesus knew so intimately and of whose presence he was so conscious was a loving Father. He pictured him as so watching the road over which the wandering prodigal was to return that, "when he was yet a great way off, his Father saw him" (Lu. 15:20); as so anxious to win hardened and wicked men to an appreciation of all that is good that, after they had killed generations of his messengers, "he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son" (Matt. 21:37); as so desiring that earth's hungry, thirsty, naked, and outcasts should be fed, clothed, and housed, that he will say on the day of judgment: "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even the least, ye did it unto me." This aspect of Jesus' conception of God has led an eminent Jewish scholar to write: "I should be far from attempting to deny the original elements in the Gospel teaching. The summons not to wait till they meet you in your sheltered and orderly path, but to go forth and seek out and redeem the sinner and the fallen, the passion to bring back to God the wretched and the outcast—all this I do not find in Rabbinism; *that* form of love seems lacking." [2]

These new elements in Jesus' conception of God came like a breath of fresh air into the religious atmosphere of Palestine. Jesus' contemporaries held that God had once spoken, but the age of revelation had passed. No Rabbi could now do more than comment upon or explain the revelation given long ago. For one to so know God that he dared to revoke even precepts of the Law was not simply unheard of, it was revolutionary. "He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes" (Mk. 1:22 &

[1] C. H. Toy, *Judaism and Christianity*, p. 86.

[2] Dr. C. G. Montefiore in Foakes-Jackson and Lake's, *Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. I, p. 79.

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

Matt. 7:29). That authority might be resented; the voice of the teacher silenced in death, but in the Providence of God it began a new era in the religion of the world.

III

To what extent the first Disciples absorbed Jesus' teaching about God before the Crucifixion we cannot now say. That it made a considerable impression is attested by the fact that so much of his teaching was remembered and ultimately found its way into the Gospels. The earliest Christian preaching as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles does not portray God in a way appreciably different from contemporary Jewish conceptions of him. As we look back on this portion of Christian history now, we see that its contribution to the Christian doctrine of God came, not from its theory of God, but from its experiences. A series of remarkable experiences began upon the Day of Pentecost. These experiences occurred not only at Jerusalem (Acts 2), where there were those who had experienced epiphanies of the risen Christ, but at Samaria (Acts 8:15) at Cæsarea (Acts 10:44, 45), and often at Corinth (1 Cor. 14). They called these experiences "speaking with tongues" (*glossolalia*), but St. Paul makes it evident that they were of the same nature as those "trances" which have taken place in many revivals since, and into which under religious excitement untutored people still sometimes fall. In these experiences the subject falls down, his lower nervous centers assume control, his brain seems to be in abeyance, and he mutters sentences that are at the best but partially intelligible. Such phenomena have occurred in all parts of the world in practically every religion, and have been uniformly accounted for by supposing that a spirit has taken possession of the subject and is speaking through him.[1] Quite in common with the rest of the world the first Christians

[1] See Davenport, *Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals.*

adopted this explanation. To them the one spirit that could so take possession of some of their number for a time was the Holy Spirit of God. This was the visible sign of his presence and approval. This was undoubtedly the visible evidence of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit so convincingly present both at Samaria and Cæsarea. At Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost it had, with a plausible show of possibility, been accounted evidence of drunkenness—a thing impossible had they really been speaking foreign languages.

However unwelcome this fact may be to many cultured Christians now, and however far removed from what is regarded as healthy religious experience, in the Providence of God it did two things for the early Christians: it convinced them that God was actually in their midst—it gave them a sense of God's nearness and power second only to that of their Master—and it fixed their thoughts on the Holy Spirit of God in a way that powerfully contributed to the ultimate recognition of the Holy Spirit as the third Person of the Trinity.

The conviction that God was actually in their midst, or at least that his Spirit was, gave to the religious life of the Early Christians an intensity, a verve, that Jewish religious life had not had since the days of the prophets. There had, indeed, been heroic periods, like that of the Maccabees, when great deeds had been done, when even women exhibited extraordinary and heroic faith, but the whole atmosphere was different. That was done for a God who had once spoken but was now silent (see 1 Macc. 4:46); the Christians rejoiced in a God who was once more pouring out his Spirit upon all flesh (Acts 2:17 ff.). The one was fidelity to a revelation once made; the other, confidence in a present blessing which was an earnest of a kingdom soon to be established. Thus, partly through the teaching of Jesus and partly through experiences which were understood to prove the truth of that teaching, the early Christians won back that consciousness of intimate communion with God which had been characteristic of the early Hebrew prophets but which the Jews had long lost. In time this produced an effect upon the Christian conception of God; but that came later.

IV

Somewhere between two and five years after the Crucifixion, Saul of Tarsus became a Christian and in the course of his life became the first contributor to the development of the Christian theory of God. It has sometimes been inferred that at the beginning of his ministry St. Paul thought of God as caring more for Jews than for Gentiles because in his early ministry he regularly sought out the Jewish synagogue in each town that he visited and preached to the congregation there, turning to Gentiles only when driven from the synagogue. This view, however, hardly does him justice. St. Paul, a native of Tarsus, belonged to the Dispersion. The differences between the Jews of the Dispersion and those of Palestine have sometimes been exaggerated. We are learning that most of the Jews of the Dispersion were loyal to the major demands of their Law, and that those of Palestine were not so ignorant of the outside world and so impervious to its influences as has often been thought. But even if Palestinian Jews had been isolated and bigoted, the problem of the relation to God of the great body of Gentiles, many of whom were noble and good, forced itself upon the attention of every thoughtful Jew of the Dispersion. The question "Is God the God of the Jews only? Is he not the God of the Gentiles also?" had forced itself upon the Jewish mind and had long before received the answer which St. Paul gave to it (Rom. 3:29): "Yea, of the Gentiles also." Two or three centuries before St. Paul Jewish history had been turned into epic Greek poetry and put into the mouth of the Sybil to help convert the Gentiles to God, and Hebrew history had been dramatized for the same purpose.[1] There is reason to believe that this problem had been often in the mind of the young man of Tarsus before his conversion, and that the peculiar line of thought

[1] Parts of a play "The Exodus," written by one Ezekiel, have been found; see Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes in Zeitalter Jesu Christi.* 4 Auf. Bd. III, p. 500 ff. On the attitude of the Jews to the conversion of the Gentiles during the New Testament and Talmudic period, see G. F. Moore, *Judaism,* Vol. I, pp. 323-353.

which made him first a persecutor and then a Christian afforded him at the very beginning of his Christian life a welcome solution of the problem. The details of this solution are set forth below, Chapter V, p. 86 ff.

It was not that St. Paul thought of God's interest and love as centered on Jews that he preached first to them. He did it partly from convenience and partly from a higher motive. The organization of the worship of the synagogue assured him as a Jew an opportunity to preach at every synagogue service which he attended. Here were congregations ready gathered; he would have been a fool who would pass such congregations by. These congregations, too, were composed of people whose whole education would make them interested in the Messiah, and St. Paul's message, like that of all the early preachers, was that Jesus was the Messiah. To most Gentiles it had to be explained what a Messiah was.

There was, however, in St. Paul's method of first preaching to Jews and then turning to Gentiles something more than convenience; there was a conscious imitation of God. In his great historical vindication of his doctrine of salvation by faith, which fills chapters 9-11 of his Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul makes it clear that God had first made himself known to the Jews, offered his salvation to them, and had thrown it open to Gentiles when Israel would not accept it. He even goes so far as to infer that God was purposely permitting Israel to be unbelieving for a time in order that, consistently with his engagements with Jews, he might have the opportunity to offer salvation to Gentiles. This view of the Divine purpose so impressed St. Paul that, in view of it, he exclaimed: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable his judgments! how untrackable his ways!" (Rom. 11:33). When, then, the Apostle to the Gentiles preached first to Jews and turned to Gentiles when Jews would have none of him, he was doing as God had done; he was following in the footsteps of his Maker. It is not too much to infer that he did this purposely and consciously.

St. Paul's conception of the universality of God's interest, care, and love was not, then, more limited than was consistent with the historical fact that Israel was a chosen people. He does not seem to have interpreted Israel's election as an election to a missionary career of service and suffering, as the Second Isaiah and the author of the Book of Jonah had done, but, in a way of his own—a way possibly shared by many Jews of his time—as an election to salvation. It is, therefore, all the more remarkable that from the first he preached to Gentiles, and thus attested the fact of his belief in God's universal love for all the people of the world.

When we come to a more intimate study of St. Paul's conception of God, we are impressed by the emphasis which he puts upon God's Fatherhood. It is not simply that God is the Father of Jesus Christ, although this is often emphasized (2 Cor. 1:3; 11:31; Eph. 1:3), but St. Paul caught something of that consciousness that God was his own personal Father—a consciousness that Christ had so labored to produce in his Disciples. He felt that he had received the spirit of sonship—the spirit that actually placed him, who had always been a son, in the enjoyment of a son's full rights (*ὑιοθεσίας*[1]), whereby he could cry *Abba* (Gal. 4:5, 6). St. Paul appears to have first learned to speak in the Aramaic tongue. *Abba,* the Aramaic word for Father,—one of the earliest sounds a child can utter—contained for St. Paul such intimate and sacred associations that, when he wished to express the intimate relationship to God into which Christ had introduced him, he reverts to this word associated with his earliest childhood's recollection. It called up a world of tenderness and love which the foreign Greek *ὁ πατήρ* could not suggest to him. We enjoy this relationship, he declares, because "God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts."

On the oneness of God St. Paul insists as strongly as any Jew (1 Cor. 8:6). God's purposes and will control the world and the destinies of all mankind; to him even Christ will some day yield up the kingdom (1 Cor. 15:24); nevertheless God is Father;

[1] "Adoption" is a most unhappy translation of it as the whole context in Galatians 3 & 4 shows.

we have access by one spirit to him (Eph. 2:18): we bow the knees to him (Eph. 3:14); we give him thanks continually (Col. 1:3, 12 & 3:17), because he is the "Father of mercies and the God of all comfort" (2 Cor. 1:3). St. Paul's theory of God was doubtless in general that of his Jewish contemporaries in which he had been educated. God is one, above all, through all, in all (Eph. 4:6). His chief difference from his Jewish brethren was, except as will be pointed out later, chiefly in his vivid realization of God's personal Fatherhood.

In one respect St. Paul's thought of God seems to fall below the best Jewish thought. Psalm 104 had beautifully asserted God's care for beasts and birds as well as for man. "He causes grass to grow for cattle. . . . . Birds of heaven sing in the branches. . . . . Young lions roar after their prey and seek their food from God." In striking contrast to this St. Paul seems to say that God does not care for oxen (1 Cor. 9:9). While this is the literal signification of his words, it is not so certain that this was St. Paul's meaning. The context would suggest the possibility that he meant: "Does God try to develop the moral character of oxen? No; it is our moral character for which he cares." Such being a possible meaning of the passage, it seems wiser to give St. Paul the benefit of the doubt and not to assume too hastily that he limits God's love and care to human beings.

St. Paul's greatest contribution to the Christian doctrine of God consists of his development of the conception which later became the center of Christian theology, that there are different Hypostases or Persons in the Godhead. True, St. Paul never employs either of these terms, one of which is Greek, the other Latin, and both of which came into use in theology only after he was dead and gone. He did, however, develop Christian thought in such a direction that it later demanded some such terms as these to express it. Indeed, the need for some such development and the beginnings of it are to be found, as already pointed out, in the Jewish thought of the preceding three or four centuries.

Whether the Jew of the period thought of God anthropomorphically or in the philosophical fashion of Philo, God seemed

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

either far-away or impassive. Some intermediary between him and the world was needed. Angels for a time supplied the need, but their ministration was not sufficiently intimate, hence the Word of God was personified; Wisdom was personified—God's Wisdom; then finally God's Spirit was at times thought to fill the world. All this has been sketched above. St. Paul as a Jew shared in this point of view; as a Christian he came to hold other views which further emphasized and developed it.

In so far as this theme has to do with the Person of Christ, it has been treated in the preceding chapter. How St. Paul, accepting Jesus as the Jewish Messiah, associated him with God as Jewish apocalyptists had done, then as a Jew identified him with Wisdom, and finally, under the pressure of gnosticism, came to think of him as God's instrument in the creation of the world and as the soul of the universe, has already been told. His interpretation of the Person and functions of Christ gave to his theology a push considerably further in the direction of recognizing differences of Hypostasis or Person in the Divine nature than any Jew had previously dared to entertain. St. Paul's conception of the Holy Spirit did not quite keep pace with the advancement of his conception of Christ, but here, too, he made some advance over his predecessors. He does not consistently speak of the Spirit as a Hypostasis of God, though at times he seems to do so.

How the early Christians were led by their ecstatic experiences to believe that the Spirit of God was with them and took possession of them has already been pointed out. That St. Paul shared to some degree the belief that ecstasies were evidences of the activity of the Spirit of God is clear from several passages in his epistles (2 Cor. 12: 1-5 & 1 Cor. 14: 18). His practical common sense taught him, however, that such exhibitions were not the highest activities of the Spirit (1 Cor. 14: 19). God sends forth the Spirit of his Son into the heart to give the realization of the Fatherhood of God (Gal. 4: 6). Those into whom the Spirit comes undergo a change of nature. Their motives become so cleansed and the habit of their wills so efficient to accomplish good, that their nature may too be called spirit (Rom. 8: 5-9). Those who are thus led by God's Spirit are God's sons (Rom. 8: 14).

In endeavoring to make it clear that those who have not this Spirit cannot understand the things of God, St. Paul in one passage (1 Cor. 2: 10-16) employs an interesting analogy. He suggests that the Holy Spirit bears something of the same relation to God that the human spirit bears to a man. Without a human spirit, he says in substance, no one can understand human affairs. A dog cannot fully understand human affairs because he lacks a human spirit. Even so, says St. Paul, no man understands the things of God except the Spirit of God. Those who have received this Spirit receive a new illumination; they "have the mind of Christ." The analogy here employed should not be pressed too far. It is clear from the context that St. Paul was not at the moment thinking of the relation of the Holy Spirit to God Himself, but was endeavoring to make it clear that Christians possessed an insight or "wisdom" which those who were not enlightened by the Holy Spirit did not possess. He was thinking of function rather than of metaphysics when he drew the analogy between the human spirit and the Divine. It should be noted also that at the beginning of the passage in question he speaks of the Spirit as "searching all things, yea, the deep things of God"—a phrase which assumes, at least for the moment, an independent activity on the part of the Spirit—almost an Hypostasis.

In another passage (2 Cor. 3: 16-18) St. Paul seems at one moment to identify the Spirit with Christ and the next to speak of the Spirit as a distinct Hypostasis. He declares that the Lord is the Spirit (vs. 17, where the preceding context shows that he uses "Lord" as a designation of Christ), and immediately afterward (vs. 18) says that we reflect as a mirror the glory of the Lord . . . . even as from the Lord the Spirit. St. Paul apparently had not clearly reached a trinitarian conception of God, but he was travelling in that direction and his thought was formed by what he had experienced of the work and leadership of Christ and by the intimate consciousness of fellowship with the Spirit of God into which Christ had led him.

Finally, in Romans 8: 26 he says: "And in like manner the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity: for we know not how to pray

as we ought; but the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered; and he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to (the will of) God." When St. Paul speaks of "groanings which cannot be uttered" he is doubtless thinking of those ecstatic experiences in which the subject seems to labor to utter the unutterable. This phenomenon he interprets as evidence of the intercession of the Holy Spirit. It led him here fully to personify the Spirit. "He who searches the hearts" is God. The passage means, therefore, that God knows what is in the mind of the Spirit—a statement which reveals a complete hypostatization of the Spirit. The function assigned to the Spirit here—interceding for the saints—is also the function assigned to him in the Fourth Gospel, which led that writer to call the Holy Spirit the Paraclete. Perhaps St. Paul's thought was still in a somewhat fluid state, but in this striking passage he seems to fully anticipate the thought of the Fourth Gospel.

V

After St. Paul there is but one writer in the New Testament who, to any appreciable degree, develops the doctrine of God; that is the author of the Fourth Gospel. The Epistle to the Hebrews, St. James, the Petrine Epistles, and the Book of Revelation assume in general the Jewish view of God and accept Jesus as his Messiah, but the author of the Fourth Gospel makes a distinct contribution.

This writer was in touch with all previous Jewish thought, but the Old Testament picture of a "live God" who does things attracted him and held his allegiance. Apparently he knew his Philo, but Philo's conception of an inactive God who is simply pure Being he regarded as false. God is a Person; he loves (Jno. 3:16) and he is capable of terrible wrath (Jno. 3:36). This

writer tells us also that Jesus said: "My father worketh even until now and I work" (Jno. 5:17). In these words he not only declares false Philo's idea of God, but repudiates the conception of the P Document in the Pentateuch that God worked but six days and rested on the seventh. God has always been working, he believed, and he is working still. He works on Sabbaths as well as on other days.

This great theologian was not satisfied to think of God as an active person. He thought it possible to understand something of God's nature. It thus happens that he has left us the three best definitions of God that were ever penned. "God is Spirit" (Jno. 4:24) defines God metaphysically. God is not a material form, be it idol or an enlarged man, nor is he merely a figment of the human imagination; he is living, active, life-giving Spirit. No material substance can be called God; no anthropomorphic forms such as have created great difficulty to Mohammedan thinkers are characteristic of him; "God is Spirit."

"God is light" (1 Jno. 1:5) defines God ethically. This writer employs the terms "light" and "darkness" with a moral meaning. The gnostics of his time were doing the same, having come under the spell of Zoroastrian influence. How is the terrible evil of the world to be accounted for? These men answered: "It is the work of an evil deity. Side by side with the God of good and almost, if not quite as powerful as he, is a god of evil—of darkness; he created this world of evil and pain." This was equivalent to saying that evil is inherent in the nature of things and can never be eradicated. With such a Gospel this writer would have nothing to do; it went directly contrary to the whole Christian message. "God is light and in him is no darkness at all" is, he declares, the message of Jesus Christ. There is no evil in the Godhead; all there is pure and white as the light; sin, therefore, is not unconquerable.

This, however, is not all: "God is love" (αγάπη-*agapē*) (1 Jno. 4:8, 16). *Agapē,* etymologists tell us, differs from *philia* (φιλία) as *diligio,* "esteem" differs from *amo,* "unreasoning, emotional affection." Not that *agapē* means merely esteem, but

that it signifies an affection based on an attraction of character rather than an affection based on emotion. It is true that three classical authors do not maintain this distinction and that sometimes it is not observed by the translators of the Septuagint, but in the New Testament the distinction is not only thoroughly observed, but there is put into the word a depth of disinterested devotion—a devotion that asks nothing and expects nothing in return—that makes the word one of rare power. "God is love" means, then, that God is not in his essential nature a cold unfeeling purity, but a purity that glows with high and unselfish affection—a purity that gives and delights to give. "God is Spirit" makes religion on the highest plane possible, for

"Spirit with spirit can meet";

"God is light" is a declaration that he is worthy of worship—that in him man's highest ideals are more than satisfied; that in worshipping, man will be uplifted; "God is love" is a declaration that God is so unselfishly devoted—so active and beneficent in his goodness that man cannot but be attracted by his love. "We love because he first loved" (1 Jno. 4: 19).

All this seems, perhaps, as we read, somewhat abstract and far away, but this writer does not leave it there. He makes the whole character of God seem not only concrete, but concrete in a most appealing way by his declaration of the Christlikeness of God. He tells us (Jno. 14: 8 ff.) that when Philip said, "Show us the Father and it sufficeth us," Jesus replied, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Jesus was merciful and self-sacrificing; he went about doing good; he sought out the lost and despised; he gave his life for others. God, this writer dares assert, is like that! All that was embodied in the life of Christ—all that Dr. Montefiore says he does not find in the Rabbis, the author of this Gospel puts into his definitions and description of God.

Great as are this writer's utterances as to the nature and character of God, they do not constitute all his contribution to the Christian thought of God. Taking up the thought of St. Paul with reference to the Son and the Holy Spirit, he so developed

them that his conception of God was an actual Trinity, though he did not employ the term. Of his contribution to the Christian conception of Christ it is unnecessary to speak here; that has been treated in the previous chapter.

The most striking differences between St. Paul's conception of the Holy Spirit and that of the author of the Fourth Gospel is that in the Fourth Gospel the Holy Spirit is fully personified and is definitely subordinated to Christ. Thus in John 7:39 we are told that "the Holy Spirit was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified." In chapter 15:26 we are told that Jesus said: "When the Paraclete (or Comforter) is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall bear witness of me." Again (ch. 16:13, 14): "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth. . . . . He shall glorify me, for he shall take of mine and show it unto you." The meaning of these passages is that the Holy Spirit was not given in the full, free, and intimate way that he was enjoyed by Christians when this author was writing, until after the Crucifixion, and that, as his last legacy to his disciples, Jesus promised to send him. The Holy Spirit, though he comes from the Father, is sent by Christ. He is Christ's representative. It is his function to bear witness to Christ and to comfort or to intercede for Christians—to teach and to guide them. In his Epistle (1 Jno. 3:24) the author further says that Christians know that Christ abides in them by the Spirit that he has given them. Again: "Hereby know we that we abide in him and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit (1 Jno. 4:13). The Spirit is also declared to be truth, and is said to join with the water and blood in bearing witness to Christ (1 Jno. 5:7, 8).

In these passages, penned about the end of the first century, we find the doctrinal fruit of that series of experiences which began on the Day of Pentecost. The Holy Spirit is recognized, at least in function, as a distinct Hypostasis of God; he is sent by Christ, and is accordingly subordinate to Christ, and it is a part of his function to bear witness to Christ. The consciousness of

the presence of the Spirit, comforting, teaching, inspiring, guiding Christians, so marked Christian lives off from the lives even of Jews who believed in the Holy Spirit, that it seemed to Christians that, until their experience began, the Holy Spirit, by comparison, had not been given at all. It was left to later thinkers and to Councils to formulate the doctrine of the Trinity, but in substance its main features are delineated here.

VI

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that, in his thought of the nature and character of God the author of the Fourth Gospel stood alone. While no other writer of the period has left us as full a record of his thoughts and beliefs, there is in one book, of slightly earlier date, evidence that the Trinitarian conception of God had already become the accepted belief of Christians generally. That book is the Gospel of St. Matthew. In Matthew 28: 19 we find the command to "make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." This trinitarian baptismal formula is in striking contrast to the baptismal formula of the earliest Christian days as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. Then they baptised simply "in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 8: 16; 19: 5). By the time the Gospel of Matthew was written Christian practice had so changed that it was believed that the command to employ the Trinitarian formula went back to Christ Himself. That fact is eloquent testimony to the widespread acceptance of a conception of the Son and the Holy Spirit that made it possible to think of them as fairly distinct from the Father. Probably few Christians of the time defined their thoughts as clearly as did the author of the Fourth Gospel, but the substance of his conceptions was theirs also.

VII

We have now sketched in outline the stages of growth in the Christian idea of God as outlined in the New Testament. We have seen how Jewish thought, while strictly monotheistic, had at certain points developed in the direction of recognizing differences of Hypostases within the Divine nature. We have noted how, in consequence of what our Lord was conscious of being and because of what the first Christians recognized him to be, as well as in consequence of their own direct experiences of God, the Christians of the Apostolic Age developed these germs into full Trinitarianism, giving Christianity a conception of God quite distinct from the Jewish. If time permitted us to study the conceptions of God expressed in later Jewish writings, we should discover that, in consequence of the friction between Jews and Christians since the Apostolic Age, later Judaism has not only made nothing of the tendencies of her pre-Christian writers to think in the direction of Hypostases in the Divine nature, but has reacted in the opposite direction, so that, in consequence of the emergence of the Christian conception of God, the Jewish conception has become, if possible, more unitarian than ever.

The Christian conception, shaped at first by the interpretation of the universe and of religious experience, was interpreted by the author of the Fourth Gospel in the terms of the *Logos*-philosophy of the Greeks, and further defined by the Fathers of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Chalcedon. Many in our modern world are anxious to know whether these conceptions correspond with reality, and, if so, how can we be sure of it.

One of old well said: "No man hath ever seen God" (Jno. 1:18). This being so, religious beliefs must always be matters of faith. Only in part can they be tested in the laboratory of life. We can live by them and note the quality of life which they produce, the degree of energy, of mental and spiritual health and happiness, but to what extent metaphysical statements about God which enter into our faith correspond to realities in the Divine

nature, must always be matters of faith. The presumption is, however, that that experience which is deepest, most vital, most normative, most fruitful, is the best interpreter of the nature and character of that Great Spirit "into whose depths our trembling spirits fall." From any point of view, therefore, even from the most modern, the remainder of the statement, just quoted in part, is true: "The only begotten Son, who is upon the bosom of the Father, he interpreted him." In character God must resemble the Best who ever trod our earth, however much he must transcend all that could be expressed in and experienced by a human life. Jesus never spoke as a philosopher, though; he never employed the phraseology of the Trinity, unless Matthew 28:19 be a direct quotation from him—a position which no real scholar would now defend. The words are, as Professor Bruce said years ago, what the early Church believed to be the will of the risen Lord.[1] The modern student, therefore, in search of reality finds in the utterances of Jesus no answer to his metaphysical question: "does the doctrine of the Trinity accord with reality?" Some, doubtless, still regard it as a revealed mystery, incapable of rational comprehension, but a mystery before which one must worship. The writer has met one professor of philosophy who held that we have no means of knowing whether one system of metaphysics is more true than another, that the *Logos*-philosophy of the Fourth Gospel and the great Christian Councils is quite as likely to be true as any other, and that, therefore, it may be accepted. Perhaps not a few could take this attitude, though many would find themselves unable to do so.

The late John Caird,[2] however, pointed out a better way. While our conceptions of God must ever remain, so long as we are in the flesh, matters of faith, the conceptions that God has always been intelligent and that he has been always loving and good carry with them the supposition that God's Personality is different from

[1] *Apologetics,* p. 463.

[2] *Fundamental Ideas of Christianity,* Lecture III; cf. also George A. Gordon, *Ultimate Conceptions of the Faith,* p. 370 ff., and G. A. Barton, *The Heart of the Christian Message,* p. 202, and *The Religions of the World,* p. 357 ff.

human personality, and that God represents in his own nature subject and object, knower and known, and that he also represents in Himself society so as to be able to have loved from all eternity without becoming the embodiment of mere self-love. It is for this conception of God that the Trinity stands. It may not embody the whole truth—God may be multitarian for aught we know—but it stands for the truth. If God's love had been acquired, it might conceivably be lost; if it is an eternal part of his nature, it will always remain so. If God be love, the very structure of the universe is on the side of the social ideal. Trinity stands for faith in the eternity of unselfish love—for faith in the certainty of the triumph of the social ideal. Donald Hankey said: "Religion is betting your life there is a God." If this be so, Christianity—Trinitarianism—may be defined as betting your life that God is love—that he is Christlike—that he is the Father of Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER IV

SIN

I

Christianity, because of the circumstances of its origin, inherited much from Judaism. If, then, one would study the earliest aspects of any phase of Christianity, he must view it against a Jewish background. This is as true of the New Testament teachings with reference to sin as of any other feature of Apostolic Christianity.

Judaism is and was a "revealed religion." It was believed that all its precepts had been given by God; it was man's duty to obey them. Sin was failure to obey; it might consist of deliberate violations (wilful sins or sinning "with a high hand"), of inadvertent failures to observe the minutiæ of the ritual law (sinning "unwittingly"), or in omissions of known duty (sins of omission). God, it was believed, would visit all sin with punishment. The heinousness of sin consisted not so much in the character of the deed as in the fact that it violated a command of God. It was an infringement of his sovereignty, and to maintain his sovereignty, God—the God of terrible and unspeakable majesty—would punish it terribly unless it were repented of and atonement made.

The Law of God in the Pentateuch neither distinguished between religious and secular things nor between ritual and moral obligations. It covered them all, and all regulations on all these matters were believed to come from God. All commands were therefore regarded as equally binding. These laws included what we call mere taboos, such as the touching of a dead body. Such taboos one might violate without knowing it, but such violation was sin just as really as murder or adultery. The offerings called

" sin-offerings " were all provided for such ritualistic transgressions and not for moral offenses. Moral offenses were sins against God because God had commanded morality, but no Jewish Rabbi in orthodox Judaism dared distinguish between moral and ritualistic obligations.[1]

Like all legislation, the Jewish law is concerned largely with outward acts. Transgressions of these can be observed and punished. Governments generally confine their attention to " overt acts." It was natural, therefore, for Jewish discussions of sin to be in good degree occupied with outward acts. The Law, however, did not stop here. At a number of points it carried its obligations into the inner life: " Thou shalt love Yahweh thy God with all thy heart " (Deut. 6:5), " Thou shalt not hate thy brother " (Lev. 19:17), " Thou shalt love thy neighbor (i. e., resident alien, *gêr*) as thyself " (Lev. 19:18), " Thou shalt not covet " (Ex. 20:17), are all instances of demands to regulate the inner life. Generally speaking, nevertheless, the Jew regarded sin as an outward act. One writer only in the Old Testament, the author of the fifty-first Psalm, considered it as an inward barrier between the soul and God (Ps. 51:6, 10, 11). The ordinary Jew was so engrossed in the demands of the law concerning the many details of ritual and of ordinary life that he apparently thought little of the obligations of the Law to which no penalties were attached. True, the recitation of the *Shema* (Deut. 6:4 ff.) at every synagogue service kept the first of the inward obligations mentioned above ever before his mind, but it is probable that the great majority believed they were fulfilling this sufficiently, if they kept the rest of the Law. This Jewish background should be kept in mind as one studies the teaching of Jesus.

Until about two hundred years before Christ no Hebrew, so far as our records go, endeavored to explain the origin of sin. One of the earliest writers to do so was the author of chapters 6-10 of the Ethiopic Enoch. He found his explanation in that bit of

[1] For an admirable statement of the Jewish point of view, see G. F. Moore's *Judaism,* Vol. I, pp. 460-473.

Hebrew myth recorded in Genesis 6: 2-4, which accounts for the birth of the heroes of olden time by the story that beings of the *elchim*-class (*elchim* means gods) came down and married human wives. According to the author of the Enoch passage, these beings, whose leader was Azazel (cf. Lev. 16), were angels who had rebelled against God in heaven. He knows the names of many of them. It was they who taught men evil, and he tells us just what wickedness each one taught man.

The son of Sirach, writing about the same time, places the blame for the beginning of sin upon Eve: "From a woman was the beginning of sin; and because of her we all die" (Ecclus. 25: 24). Ben Sirach had the merit of pointing to the disobedience in Eden as the starting-point of sin, however unfair he may have been in emphasizing Eve's share in it, and the majority of Jews in later time looked to Adam and Eve as the first sinners. More than a hundred years later the author of the Wisdom of Solomon [1] definitely connected the beginning of sin with the transgression of Adam in Eden and for the first time identified the Serpent of Eden with the devil (Wisdom 2: 23-24). This view is adopted by the writer of the "Book of the Secrets of Enoch" (ch. 31: 6), and by later Jewish writers. We shall meet it again in the New Testament. The Jewish Rabbis in commenting upon it observe that Adam received from God but one command, and did not keep that.

II

When we turn to Jesus' teaching the first thing that strikes us is that he did not share with the Rabbis the belief that all God's commands were equally important. When, to test him, a Pharisee asked him which was the greatest command of the Law, he did not hesitate to reply: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy

[1] For later Rabbinical thought, see G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. I, pp. 474-496.

heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second like unto it is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments the whole law hangeth, and the prophets" (Matt. 22:37-40). One who could make such distinctions in the Law was clearly not blinded to ethical values by traditional reverence. There is, however, in the Gospels evidence that the point of view of Jesus was not unique; it was shared even by some of the Pharisaical lawyers. We are told in St. Mark's Gospel (Mk. 12:32-34) that the lawyer who put this question to Jesus commended our Lord's reply: "Of a truth, Teacher, thou hast well said that he is one; and there is none other but he: and to love him with all the heart and with all the understanding, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbor as himself, is much more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices." Not only did this lawyer admit the truth of our Lord's utterance upon this point, but we are told that, when our Lord questioned another lawyer as to what requirements necessary to eternal life were written in the Law, the lawyer himself had selected the very same commands that Jesus did as the two that were alone vital[1] (Lu. 10:25-28). In selecting love to God and love to the resident foreigner as requirements superior to ritual law, Jesus simply allied Himself with the best that was in Pharisaism itself.

In another utterance Jesus seems to recognize that an obligation rested upon Jews to observe the ritual law. "Woe unto you Pharisees! for ye tithe mint and rue and every herb, and pass over justice and the love of God" (or as the variant reads, "have left undone the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy, and faith"); but these ought ye to have done and not to leave the other undone" (Lu. 11:42 & Matt. 23:23). These words recognize the claims of ritual, but place the sin of the Pharisees in the omission of moral duties and of the religious duty of heartfelt love to God. In fact our Lord as a Jew appears to have kept the ritual

[1] Such unorthodox opinions, if they existed later, were not preserved in the Rabbinical works on which G. F. Moore's work, cited above, is based.

law Himself except as it seemed to stand in the way of higher ethical and humanitarian obligations.

This observation brings us to a third point: our Lord's abrogation of parts of the Pentateuchal Law, and his teaching concerning the essential element in sin. In that compendium of the teaching of Jesus called the "Sermon on the Mount" there are collected five examples in which our Lord takes up five points of the Law and points out that the real sin in each case lies not only in the outward act, but equally in the heart (Matt. 5:21-48). Of old the Law had prohibited killing; Jesus declared that every one angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment, and those whose light esteem of their fellows leads them to despise their brothers shall also be in danger of punishment. The Law had prohibited adultery; Jesus declared the lustful look to be adultery in the heart. The Law forbade the breaking of an oath; Jesus forbade one to hold the double standard of truth that the taking of an oath implies; one's unconfirmed word should be as reliable as his word when he calls upon God to attest it. The Law had enshrined the savage revengeful custom of the primitive Semites, still the sacred custom of Arabia, "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," and had thus made revenge a sacred obligation. This law Jesus definitely set aside. He said: "Resist not him that is evil." His words, interpreted by the context, mean "banish all feelings of revenge from the heart and in no way let your conduct be guided by them." The Law had seemed to make hatred of an enemy a sacred obligation; in contrast to this Jesus said: "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you."

By this series of utterances our Lord makes two things very clear: he regards sin as committed in the heart; it is in good degree a matter of the inward life. On this question Jesus takes his stand with the author of the fifty-first Psalm. This is reinforced by other passages, in which Jesus definitely declared that the heart of man is the source of evil, and that sin proceeds from it. Tabooed food does not, he declared, defile; the sin that defiles comes from man's own inner life (Matt. 15:19, 20 & Mk. 7:20, 23).

The other matter which he makes evident is that he dared to set aside parts of the Law; he did not regard it all as the Law of God. When the Law fostered hate and revenge—things in themselves destructive of the inner life—he definitely set it aside. This fact differentiated him from orthodox Jews. All Law, they thought, was given by God; to transgress it was to repudiate God's sovereignty, and hence was sin. Jesus regarded that alone as having divine sanction which accords with the laws of the moral and spiritual life. Sin, from this point of view, could never be the mere violation of taboo; it must be the transgression of some moral requirement.

This fact is attested by other incidents of our Lord's ministry. It is necessary here simply to allude to that whole series of beneficent ministries which, in violation of restrictions of the Oral Law he performed on the Sabbath. The Jews regarded the Oral Law as from God; it was but the expression of the meaning of the Torah, or written Law, which God had given. Rigidly applied, however, the precepts concerning the Sabbath often interfered with beneficent work and cramped spiritual life. In dealing with the subject Jesus brushed all casuistry aside by going back to God's original intent: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Mk. 2:27). To Jesus, sin lay wholly in the region of that which is moral.

One or two sayings of Jesus are recorded in the Gospels which indicate that he recognized degrees of heinousness in sin. He declared (Mk. 3:28, 29 & Matt. 12:31, 32) that all sins were forgivable except one—blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. That "hath never forgiveness." St. Mark reports Jesus as saying that one who commits it "is in danger of an eternal sin" (ἔνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος). For the understanding of this saying of our Lord one must appeal to the context. It was uttered when Jews attributed the beneficent works of healing, performed by Jesus, to Beelzebub. Their explanation of the source of these good works revealed a moral color-blindness on their part—a color-blindness that was apparently self-induced. They had so long thought and

acted insincerely that they could call evil good and good evil, if evil were only orthodox and good heterodox. Evidently our Lord's words imply that it is possible for men so to eradicate the power of appreciating good that it can never be recovered. Such are "in danger of an eternal sin."

As to the origin of sin, the source for it that our Lord mentions, according to the Synoptic report of his teaching, is the heart of man. He apparently accepted the current view of his time that Satan or Beelzebub was the prince or ruler of the kingdom of wickedness, but he offers no hint that Satan originates sin, neither does he allude to Adam as in any way responsible for the sins of mankind.

III

St. Paul's conception of sin, like some other aspects of his teaching, has been greatly misunderstood. He possessed an ardent nature, and was trained as a Rabbi in a Pharisaical school. He was accordingly brought up on the Jewish view of the Law and of sin as transgression of a definite command of God. Years after he had abandoned the Jewish point of view he could write: "I had not known sin, except through the Law" (Rom. 7:7). There is evidence also that as a Jew he regarded all the Law as on one level,[1] making no distinction between moral and ritualistic commands. All, he thought, were equally sacred because all were commanded by God. At this period of his life he regarded the Law as the one avenue of approach to God; it was, of course, binding on the Jew, and the Gentile could only approach God acceptably by becoming a proselyte and keeping the Law. From this point of view he was in part emancipated by the process of thought which made him first a persecutor and then made him a Christian. As that process of thought and its consequences are

[1] See Galatians, 3:13 and the discussion of it in the next chapter.

outlined in the next chapter, we need only observe here that it led him to believe that in Christ Jesus God had opened a Mercy Seat apart from the Law, and that they who approached God at that Mercy Seat need not come through the avenue of the Law. We are accustomed to think that, while Christ emancipated us from the ritual law, nevertheless the moral precepts of the Law are still binding upon us as God's commands, but it was not so with St. Paul. He believed Christ emancipated Christians from the whole Law—from all its commands, the moral as well as the ritual. His position on this matter comes out clearly in the sixth chapter of First Corinthians, where he is discussing the immorality of a man who had married his step-mother—an act that shocked both Jewish and Greek sensibilities. The easy way to deal with such a case would be to quote the command "Thou shalt not commit adultery," or to cite the law of prohibited degrees of kinship in Leviticus 18, but St. Paul did not do either of these. Instead he declared, "All things are lawful for me; but all things do not profit. All things are lawful for me; but I will not be brought under the power of any" (1 Cor. 6:12), and in the discussion that followed he makes it clear that such acts should not be performed, not because they violate a precept, but because they are contrary to the laws of the spiritual life. It is spiritual suicide to be sensual. It is for this reason that a Christian should be chaste, not because there are commands against unchastity in the Old Testament Law. That was St. Paul's view. We may differ with him as to the wisdom of such teaching, but we cannot truthfully deny that it was his. In justice to him it should, however, be said that he regarded this freedom from Law as enjoyed by Christians only. Upon all others the Law was binding. Because St. Paul felt himself emancipated from the Law, it does not follow that he thought lightly of sin; the very opposite is the truth. Sin was to him the great tragedy of life; the tragedy of the world. In the seventh chapter of his Epistle to the Romans he makes it clear that he regards sin as the conscious failure to do what one knows to be right. It involves conscious violations of known duty

and conscious failure to attain recognized ideals of conduct (Rom. 7: 15-24). To a sensitive soul such as St. Paul possessed—a soul incapable of tolerating a sham even in itself—such inability was exquisite torture. But there is—so St. Paul found—a pull downward in the fleshly tendencies of the body which forever shackles and thwarts all the soul's endeavors to do and be the best. This is the tragedy of life. St. Paul had first experienced it when he tried to observe the command, "Thou shalt not covet." As this was a command of the Law he could say, "I had not known sin, except through the Law." He could honor father and mother, refrain from stealing, killing, and from adultery, but, to save his life, he could not prevent the wandering of desire. His attention was thus called to a condition which he later perceived to arise, not because God had long ago given a command to Moses, but from the nature and constitution of the human being with its bodily appetites and its weak will.

It was natural, therefore, for him to regard the "flesh" as the source of sin. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousies, wraths, factions, divisions, heresies, envyings, drunkenness, revellings, and such like" (Gal. 5: 19-21). "If ye live after the flesh ye must die; but if by the spirit ye mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live" (Rom. 8: 13). Such utterances make it clear that St. Paul thought of sin as a yielding to the behests of those impulses which arise from the appetites and impulses of the body. This was to prove traitorous to the spirit; it enslaved the spirit; it destroyed it. He did not, however, regard the flesh as in itself corrupt. He was untouched by the Zoroastrian conception of the inherent corruption of matter. There is not a trace of this thought anywhere in his writings.

In this connection there are two points which merit further discussion: St. Paul's conception of the relation of Adam to the human race, and whether St. Paul regarded human nature as totally depraved. On both these points he has often been misunderstood.

As to the first of them, it has been customary since the time of St. Augustine to say that St. Paul believed that all men sinned in Adam, but this opinion is based upon a mistranslation of a Greek idiomatic phrase in the Old Latin translation which St. Augustine employed. The phrase occurs in Romans 5:12: "As through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, because all sinned." It so happens that in this passage St. Paul, instead of using the ordinary Greek word for "because" (ὅτι), employed a somewhat infrequent idiom, ἐφ ᾧ, which the Revised Version renders "for that." This phrase the translators of the Old Latin misunderstood and so rendered it literally by *in eo,* "in him." Naturally, therefore, St. Augustine understood St. Paul to say that all men sinned in Adam, whereas St. Paul says nothing of the sort. In the passage in question St. Paul says three things: 1. That death entered the world through one man Adam. Genesis 3:22 implies that, had Adam not sinned he might have been immortal; it was natural, therefore, for St. Paul to infer that death entered the world through Adam's act. 2. In common with other Jews St. Paul infers that all Adam's descendants lost immortality because of Adam's act.[1] Men's bodies die because of Adam's error. The thought is the same as that of 1 Corinthians 15:22, where ἐν[2] with the dative should be translated as instrumental rather than locative, thus: "As by Adam all die, so also by Christ shall all be made alive." 3. St. Paul finally states that the fact that all men die is not an injustice, since all are sinners. Like Adam, they have transgressed; like him they die. He does not say that all sinned in Adam, or that all die because of Adam's sin; he does assert the universality of sin and the universality of death, and implies that in both of these Adam led the way.

Both in the passage under discussion and in Romans 3:9-18 St. Paul asserts the universality of sin. In the passage last men-

[1] See, for example, 4 Esdras 7:116 ff. Cf. also the other opinions of this sort collected by G. F. Moore, *Judaism,* I, 475 ff.

[2] Ἐν with the dative is in the New Testament frequently instrumental like the Hebrew preposition Ḇ-.

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

tioned he asserts it so emphatically that he has sometimes been understood to be saying that human nature is totally depraved. He is, however, only saying in a very positive way that all men have sinned. He reinforced his assertion, too, by quotations from the Psalms and from Isaiah—quotations which do not, in their turn, say that human nature is totally depraved. That such was not St. Paul's belief is shown by earlier passages in the same Epistle. He not only declares (Rom. 1 : 20) that God has made Himself in a measure known to all men through his works, but says (Rom. 2 : 14) that heathen, who have not the revealed Law "do by nature the things of the Law." One who could so write, did not regard human nature as wholly corrupt. Such men, he says, have a "law of God written in their hearts."

In common with the Jews of his time St. Paul's belief in Satan was very real. He regarded him as a hinderer of all good things and frequently speaks of him as preventing the carrying out of cherished plans. In 2 Corinthians 4 : 4 he speaks of him as "the god of this age who has blinded the minds of the unbelieving." Just what part of responsibility for sin fell upon Satan and what on the individual sinner, he nowhere tells us. As has been shown above, St. Paul worked out through his own experience a theory of sin and its origin that is thoroughly sound from the point of view of any age, because it is based on the facts of human nature and of experience, but, like every other man, he shared certain inherited views. These inherited views connected the beginnings of sin with Eden and identified the serpent of Eden with Satan.[1] Adam's connection with human sin St. Paul gauged fairly accurately,[2] as has already been pointed out, though his enjoyment of

[1] St. Paul thus follows the Wisdom of Solomon in tracing the entrance of sin into the world to the serpent of Genesis, and, through St. Paul's influence, that has been the generally accepted Christian view. Two second century New Testament writers, who wrote under the influence of the book of Enoch, held, however, to the older view that sin was introduced into the world by the lustful angels of Genesis 6: 2-4. These writers were the author of the Epistle of St. Jude (see vs. 6 ff.), and the author of 2 Peter, who was influenced by St. Jude (see 2 Pet. 2: 4 ff.).

[2] It is not intended by the above remark to imply the historicity of the Genesis story. On any theory we are descended from ancestors who have sinned. Adam stands for these ancestors.

the analogy and antithesis between Adam and Christ leads him at times, as in Romans 5 : 13-21, to rhetorically magnify Adam's influence. This was but a passing phase, however. In other passages St. Paul correctly discerns the influences which lead to sin, and his great moral earnestness and spiritual passion lead him to paint it as it really is, the curse and tragedy of human life.

IV

Apart from the teaching of Jesus, the writings of St. Paul, and the Fourth Gospel (of which we shall speak later), the New Testament contains little that is new with regard to sin. The different strata of the Book of Revelation regard the world as hopelessly sinful, but the sin consists as a rule in prosperity, the exercise of power, the gratification of the appetites, and the oppression of God's people. There is nothing here to differentiate the Christian conception of sin from its Jewish predecessor, except that the persecuted are now Christians instead of Jews.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews does, apparently, add one new thought, viz. : that the rejection of Christ or the failure to believe in his Messiahship is a sin. In reality he only puts in words what St. Paul had implied in Romans 9-11. After beginning his Epistle with the statement that " God, having spoken of old time by the prophets . . . . hath at the end of these days spoken unto us by one who is Son," he asks (Heb. 2 : 3), " For if the word spoken through angels proved steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation? which, having at the first been spoken through the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard him." The " word spoken by angels " was the Jewish Law. The Jews of the time understood the " holy ones " of Deuteronomy 33 : 2 to be angels and understood that they acted as intermediaries in bringing the Law from God to

Moses. St. Paul (Gal. 3:19) and other Jewish Christians (see Acts 7:53), as well as this author, also believed the Law to have been so given. To transgress the Law was, in certain cases, punishable by death. When, therefore, the writer to the Hebrews cites such transgressions and follows them by the question just quoted, he reveals the fact that his conception of sin is still the Jewish conception—the transgression of a command of God—the flouting of his authority—despising his majesty, and also that he regards failure to believe the Christian message as a more heinous offense than any crime which the Law counted deadly, inasmuch as God had spoken the Christian message through his Son, and the Law had been communicated through angels only. It is this that leads him to express the exhortation (ch. 3:12), "Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief in falling away from the living God." From this point of view failure to believe in Christ becomes the deadliest of sins.

The author of the Epistle of St. James takes a different view and one which agrees more nearly with the teaching of Christ and of St. Paul. He traces the cause of sin to lust or desire (Jas. 1:15). It is lust that brings forth sin and sin, when it is full grown, that brings forth death. Further, he regards respect of persons—judging a man by his clothing rather than by his manhood—as sin (Jas. 2:9). Finally he declares that it is a sin for one to know how to do good and not to do it (Jas. 4:17). This covers sins of omission. It is noteworthy that all this writer's utterances about sin are of an ethical or spiritual nature.

While the author of the Pastoral Epistles, which are clearly not St. Paul's, adds nothing to our knowledge of the New Testament conception of sin, he does make an interesting reference to its origin. He tells us (1 Tim. 2:13, 14) that "Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not beguiled, but the woman being beguiled hath fallen into transgression." True, the writer is not discussing sin, but the position of woman. The inference which he draws is not that woman introduced sin into the world, but that she should be in subjection. Nevertheless his remark is interesting. It shows that he connected the beginnings of sin with

the Garden of Eden and that, like the Son of Sirach, he regarded the woman as the one whose weakness led to disaster. But how, if Adam was not deceived, he was superior to Eve, the writer does not explain. One would suppose that he who disobeyed God's command, knowing what he did, should be regarded as more of a sinner than she who was deceived. The author of the Pastoral Epistles seems to think Adam superior to Eve because of an intelligence which was superior to Satan's wiles. He evidently was not thinking of sin, but his remark shows that he shared the belief of his time as to sin's origin.

V

In the Fourth Gospel we come into a different atmosphere. Its author, though a Jew, lived a generation after the separation of the Church and the Synagogue in a community where the Jews were hostile to the Church. He had in many respects, though not in all, outgrown the Jewish way of looking at vital religious questions. He lived in a community permeated by gnostic theories and he wrote in part to combat them. It often happens that men are profoundly influenced by the systems which they oppose. In seeking a logical foothold from which a well-articulated system can be overthrown it seems necessary to admit in some degree the premises from which the system starts. The basic premise of gnosticism was that there are two divine Powers, of nearly equal strength, the Power of light and the Power of darkness, that these are in opposition to one another and that the universe is the scene of their conflict. While the author of the Fourth Gospel opposes the gnostic theory that matter is corrupt, asserting that the Divine *Logos,* who was one with God from the beginning, actually became flesh (Jno. 1 : 14), he nevertheless so far approaches gnosticism as to regard the universe (*kosmos*) as the scene of a great struggle between light and darkness, good and evil, God and

Satan. The universe is, he believed, in the clutch of the dark or immoral Power. Although "the Light shines in the darkness and the darkness does not overcome it" (Jno. 1:5), he hardly hoped for the salvation of the whole world. He portrays Christ as saying: "I pray not for the world, but for those whom thou hast given me (Jno. 17:9). While the author often thinks of men in the mass and alludes to them as "the world," nevertheless men are saved as individuals. It is those that receive Christ to whom he gives "power to become children of God" (Jno. 1:13).

As has already been pointed out this writer believed that the eternal *Logos* became incarnate in Christ. That "was the true Light" (Jno. 1:9). In a universe which was the scene of a struggle between Light and Darkness, to reject the light, when once it had shined was a sin—the greatest sin. It was natural, therefore, for the writer of the Fourth Gospel to expand and emphasize a thought earlier expressed by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that rejection of Christ is a deadly sin. "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him" (Jno. 3:36). "And he, when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin . . . . because they believe not on me" (Jno. 16:8, 9). He who denies that Jesus is the Christ denies the Father as well as the Son (1 Jno. 2:22, 23)—a statement which apparently means that such men have entirely misconceived the nature of God. From the writer's point of view he could not help regarding disbelief in Christ as the most heinous sin. No other conclusion was possible; it was the rejection of God's most precious gift to man. It was repudiating the divine majesty more emphatically than one could do by transgressing a mere command. Thus, although the writer is bitterly opposed to Judaism, his conception of this greatest sin is not unlike the Jewish view of sin in general. Other passages, too, make it clear that his conception of the nature of sin was, like that of the Jews, the violation of God's commandments. "This is the love of God that we keep his commandments" (1 Jno. 5:3).

The author does not enter into any analysis of human nature, nor, like St. Paul and the author of the Epistle of St. James, trace sin to appetite, but, like St. Paul, he regards sin as conscious disobedience. He had outgrown the Levitical conception that the unconscious violation of a taboo was sin. He tells us that Christ said: "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no excuse for their sin" (Jno. 15:22). In addition to the rejection of Christ, the common immoralities are, he says, sins. "Sin is lawlessness" (1 Jno. 3:15). "He that saith he abideth in him, ought himself also to walk even as he walked" (1 Jno. 2:6). "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him" (1 Jno. 2:4). Errors of conduct were, in this writer's belief, closely bound up with errors of theology. Men's views of life were false because their views of God were wrong.

The writer had outgrown the view combated in the Book of Job that all misfortunes are punishments for sin. When the Disciples asked Jesus concerning the man born blind (Jno. 9:2): "Who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he should be born blind?", he tells us that Jesus answered: "Neither did this man sin nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him." Misfortunes often have nothing to do with conduct; they are due to the working out of the great purposes of God.

Another interesting point in this writer's conception of sin is the fact that he does not regard all sins as on the same plane. There are gradations of sins. There is a sin unto death; there is also a sin not unto death (1 Jno. 5:16, 17). He also tells us that Christ said to Pilate: "he that delivered me unto thee hath *greater* sin" (Jno. 19:11). While this is true, this author recognizes with St. Paul (Rom. 6:16) the enslaving power of sin: "Every one," he tells us Jesus said, "that committeth sin is the bondservant of sin" (Jno. 8:34). This fact the modern knowledge of the psychology of habit emphatically reinforces.

Like St. Paul, the author emphasizes the universality of sin. "If we say that we have no sin," he declares, "we deceive our-

selves and the truth is not in us" (1 Jno. 1:8); also, "The whole world lieth in wickedness" (1 Jno. 5:19). In another passage which now stands in this Gospel, but which its author did not put there—the story of the woman taken in sin—we are told that Jesus said: "Let him that is without sin among you cast a stone at her. . . . And they went out one by one, beginning from the eldest even unto the last" (Jno. 8:7, 9).

Finally this author, too, traces the origin of sin to Satan. "He that doeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning" (1 Jno. 3:8). Again, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do. He was a murderer from the beginning and stood not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar and the father thereof" (Jno. 8:44). It is not simply that Satan once tempted Adam and so all men sinned; Satan is the power of darkness that is still potent in the world; he entices men to sin, and, when they sin, they become his children. How and when Satan obtained this control, the author does not tell us. The world was made by the *Logos* who became flesh (Jno. 1:3), but when "He came unto his own, they that were his own received him not" (Jno. 1:11). How this came about—what had wrought such a change in "his own" that they "received him not" he nowhere explains. He assumes (Jno. 8:39, 40) that Abraham was in harmony with God; he also assumes the moral corruption of the world. He assumes that Satan is the originator of evil, and that they who persistently sin become his children, but his interest is not a historical interest. He is content to portray vividly the fact that into the midst of the world's corruption and darkness there has streamed a creative ray of divine light in the person and words of Jesus Christ.

VI

Such in outline is the New Testament portrayal of sin. A people's conception of sin is the reverse picture of its conception

of righteousness. As ideals of righteousness rise high, the opposite of those ideals is seen to be hideous and awful. Only where a vivid consciousness of the worth of purity and of sterling character exists are men able to regard sin—that sin which not only results in social disorder, but which fills the heart with insincerity, hate, and impurity—as a black and terrible canker that must be eradicated from life. In some countries, as, for example, China, noble systems of outward morals have been set up in the absence of anything which from our point of view could be called a consciousness of sin. In Buddhism we find a keen consciousness of sin, but it is combined with a belief in the worthlessness of conscious existence. In Judaism and Christianity we have lofty conceptions of righteousness combined with high appreciation of the continued value of conscious life and faith that God will reward the conquest of sin by granting an ever enlarging life and an ever keener and more vivid consciousness of its value. This is a combination which bears the better fruits in character, noble as the character of many Buddhists has been. New Testament Christianity, however, by recognizing, under Christ's leadership, the fact that the source of sin is in the heart, and that its presence there is the fact of real significance (a point which Judaism, while recognizing, did not particularly emphasize), and by freeing itself from intricate taboos, which fastened the attention on outward details, many of which were of no moral importance, made great advances over its parent religion.

The characteristic of New Testament teaching is its intense conception of sin as the one great evil in the world—as the central fact of life—around which all the powers of heaven, earth, and hell range themselves. All its writers believed that all the manifestations of God in history look to the annihilation of this malignant power in the human soul.

CHAPTER V

THE DEATH OF CHRIST[1]

How to interpret the purpose and influence of our Lord's death has long been one of the central problems of theology. Interpreters have one and all taken their point of departure from the New Testament. Often they have misunderstood what they found there, and many of them have never suspected that there are differences of interpretation on the part of New Testament writers. It is the purpose of this chapter briefly to review the principal New Testament interpretations of Christ's death, beginning with those of our Lord Himself.

I

During the last weeks of our Lord's earthly life he several times referred to his death, but only two of his utterances give us any clue to the meaning which he himself attached to it. The first of these is the words with which he concludes his utterance to the sons of Zebedee, in reply to their request made during his last journey to Jerusalem: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mk. 10:45 & Matt. 20:28). Doubtless all are to some degree familiar with the theories of atonement to which the interpretation of this passage has given rise, from Marcion, Basilides, and Origen to Anselm, Calvin, and Grotius. We are all nevertheless under obligation to try to form some idea of the meaning of the utterance to our Lord himself. The word translated "ran-

[1] A paper read before the Clericus of Philadelphia and the Convocation of Reading in the Diocese of Bethlehem.

som," λύτρον in the Greek, representing, perhaps, *pûrkān* in the Aramaic which our Lord was speaking, is employed in the Septuagint as the Greek equivalent of several Hebrew words: for *ga'al* and its derivative *ga'ula,* which means to "act the part of a kinsman," "buy back" (land that has been taken for debt), "avenge" (the death of a kinsman), etc.; for *kopher,* from *kāphar,* meaning originally either "cover" or "wipe off"; for *m^{e}khîr,* from a root meaning primarily "be in front of," then "something acceptable," then "price"; and for various derivatives of *pādā,* "ransom." In Exodus 21:30 as a translation of *kopher* it is the ransom put on the life of a man whose ox has gored a person to death; in Leviticus 19:20 in translating the Hophal of the Hebrew verb *pādā* it is used of the bride-price of a betrothed girl; it is employed in Leviticus 25:24 as a translation of *g^e'ulah,* the redemption price of mortgaged or estranged land; in Numbers 3:12 the Levites are said to be the λύτρα of the firstborn sons of the Hebrews where it has no equivalent in the Hebrew; in Isaiah 45:13 λύτρον is used of the price (*m^{e}khîr*) which King Cyrus will not charge for letting the Israelites return from their captivity.

An examination of the use of the word in the Septuagint makes it clear that it conveyed no sacrificial meaning in the ritual sense of that term. It denotes rather something precious or valuable which one surrenders, either to gain something more desirable or out of a feeling of obligation or love to a kinsman.

Recent interpreters are, however, fairly well agreed that, when our Lord uttered these words he was thinking of the 53d chapter of Isaiah and of himself as the "suffering Servant." In that chapter it is said (vs. 11) that the "righteous servant" shall justify "many"; this it probably was which led our Lord to say his life was given "a ransom for many"—a phrase which is interpreted in 1 Timothy 4:10 as applying to all.

It is probable, therefore, that our Lord spoke of himself in these great words as the Servant of Jehovah whom the prophet represents as suffering for the sins of the nations. In the Old Testament there are four theories of the way sins may be put

away: 1. That Yahweh may have his heart softened by smelling the odor of sacrifices, and so be led to remit the punishment which he would normally inflict for transgression. 2. The prophetic teaching that sin may be put away by act of the will and that the righteous living which results will please Yahweh. 3. The conception that suffering atones for sin, and that after one has suffered sufficiently long the penalty will be remitted. 4. The piacular view of the Day of Atonement, the rites of which, while adapted from a very old Semitic ritual, appear first in Hebrew legislation about 450 B. C.

The poem of the Suffering Servant which our Lord apparently applied to himself was written by the prophet who first formulated the third of the views just stated. The idea itself is a very natural one; it is very old, and finds expression in Babylonian Penitential Psalms. It took the tragedy of Israel's exile—the tearing apart and strangling of the nation—to call forth a powerful expression of the thought. The great prophet of the Exile, whom scholars call the Second Isaiah, as he brooded over the tragedy that had befallen the chosen people and asked its cause, recognized that it had happened because of their sin. He felt, however, that the cup of bitterness that Judah had been required to drain was a punishment in excess even of her iniquity, and as he sought further for the cause, it dawned on him that she had been suffering for the world—to make the true God known to the nations. So he began his book with the message: "Cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned, that she hath received at Yahweh's hand double for all her sins" (Isa. 40:2). That the excess of suffering was borne for the nations, he further makes clear in the poem in chs. 52:13-53:12, in which he portrays the kings of the earth as looking upon bruised and broken Israel, whose appearance was "deeply marred out of all human likeness" and as they gaze, "awe-struck in silence," it dawns on them that "he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." In the prophetic picture the effect of the excessive suffering is to create repentance on the part of the nations.

If, then, in seeking the meaning of the great words about his death which our Lord uttered to the two sons of Zebedee, we assume that Old Testament connotations may give us a clue to his meaning, we are led to understand that he employed the term "ransom" to suggest at once his kinship to humanity—a kinship also suggested by the term "Son of Man"—and the costliness of the offering he was making, and that his allusion to Isaiah was intended to suggest that, by the costliness of that offering, he would reach and soften the hearts of men everywhere.

The other passage which must come into consideration in the endeavor to recover the interpretation which Christ put upon his own death contains the words uttered at the Last Supper in connection with the cup. St. Mark gives them: "This is my blood of the covenant which is poured out for many" (Mk. 14:24); St. Matthew: "This is my blood of the covenant which is poured out for many unto remission of sins" (Matt. 26:28); St. Paul: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood" (1 Cor. 11:25). The significant words in this utterance are "covenant" and "blood." If our Lord said "new covenant" as St. Paul reports, it would only slightly alter the emphasis. St. Matthew's addition of the words "for the remission of sins" is clearly an editorial addition. In recovering our Lord's meaning they may be disregarded. The important words are "covenant" and "blood"—words which point to an ancient and world-wide method of attesting covenants.

All over the world covenants of brotherhood have been formed and attested by the contracting parties opening their veins and sucking one another's blood.[1] The Arabs[1] sometimes caught the blood of a victim in a dish, dipped their hands in it and licked their hands. Another method of attesting a covenant common among Semites was to eat together, and thus come to share the same blood or the same life. According to the J document the covenant between Yahweh and Israel was attested in this way at Horeb: Moses and Aaron and the seventy elders of Israel "beheld

[1] Cf. W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, 2d ed., p. 314 ff.

God and did eat and drink" (Ex. 24: 11). According to Genesis 15: 10 and 17 Yahweh confirmed his covenant with Abraham by walking in the form of a flaming torch between the two halves of sacrificial victims, thus binding himself by the influence of their devoted lives. Perhaps some such ritual always accompanied Hebrew oaths, for the Hebrew word for "swear" is *nishbaʿ*, "bring one's self under the influence of seven." According to the E document the covenant at Sinai was sealed by sprinkling the blood of a sacrificial victim on the altar, which represented God, and on the people. In this ritual the bond was sealed by the blood of the victim which acted as a bond between the contracting parties. Which one of these figures our Lord intended to suggest, we cannot now say. Possibly he meant to bring all of them before the minds of his disciples. The one sure fact is that he speaks of his blood as the attestation of a covenant between God and men. He suggests the fact that his life and death mark a new epoch in God's relation to mankind. He declares here what the Fourth evangelist afterward put in this way: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but might have everlasting life." That fact is the heart of the new covenant, and that covenant is attested by our Lord's life blood.

II

When we pass on to ask what was St. Paul's interpretation of the death of Christ, it is necessary before seeking an answer to orient ourselves a little by recalling the system of thought in which he was reared and in which he lived. Otherwise we shall miss his whole point of view. Indeed it is not too much to say that most interpreters of St. Paul have missed his point of view. They have only succeeded in reading back into his pages what they wanted to hold; they have not discovered what he did hold. This has been largely due to the fact that St. Paul's point of view was

that of first century Judaism—a point of view which, so far as Christians were concerned, received its death knell with the destruction of Jerusalem, and which was not understood even by the Christian writers of the second century. Most modern New Testament scholars have been too slenderly equipped with a knowledge of Semitic to discover and appreciate St. Paul's system of thought. For this reason it will be necessary to give in outline a reconstruction of the line of thought that led Saul of Tarsus to persecute Christians, which afterward made him a Christian, and which determined the outlines of his conception of the effect of the death of Christ. Fortunately he has, in his Epistles, left us the materials for doing this.[1]

The key to St. Paul's thought is found in Galatians 3:13: "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us; as it is written, 'Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.'" "As it is written" is a phrase by which the Old Testament is quoted. If we turn back to the Old Testament we find that St. Paul has quoted Deuteronomy 21:22, 23, a passage which provides that a man who is hanged shall be taken down before nightfall. The reason given is this, "For he that is hanged is accursed of God; that thou defile not thy land." The point of the Deuteronomic law is just this: God's curse rests upon every man who is hanged; that curse is contagious, and the land must not be exposed to its contagion during the night, or it will be infected thereby. This is a primitive and, if you please, a half-superstitious point of view; but even so it can be proved that it was held by both Jews and Christians until after the time of Paul.[2]

Stated in a different way this view of the law seems more reasonable. All the law is from God; it is accordingly all sacred

[1] The reconstruction here given was first worked out by the late C. C. Everett in his *Gospel of Paul,* Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1893, and in part by the present writer in "The Spiritual Development of Paul" in the *New World,* VIII (1899), 111-124; also more briefly, in the writer's *Heart of the Christian Message,* 2d ed., The Macmillan Co., 1912, chapter II.

[2] That it was held by Christians is evidenced by Hebrews 13:11, 12 (cf. Everett, *op. cit.,* 156) and Acts 15:28, 29; also, the Mishna, Sanhedrin, VI, 6, for Jewish belief.

and all equally binding. To make a distinction between the ritualistic and the moral laws would be rationalism—it would be to intrude the human judgment into a region into which it has no right to enter.

This was the point of view of St. Paul. The Jews who became Christians before him were less logical than he; but to his mind the law's curse rested upon Jesus because he had been crucified, or hanged on a tree. As he saw Christians multiplying and increasingly large numbers of Jews swept into the Church, it appeared to him that the contagion of the curse of a hanged man, which the law feared might spread over the land, was actually spreading among the people. For this reason he exerted all his force of character, influence, and industry, to stamp out the curse.

Meantime another influence was at work in Saul's life which made him dissatisfied with the law at the very moment when he so strenuously sought to serve it. There was one law in the Decalogue which he could not keep. It was the command, "Thou shalt not covet." The external commands he could fulfil, but the wanderings of desire he could not control. Now Saul was a most earnest man. He was thorough in all his thought, and not one consciously to tolerate a sham. The struggle which this failure to keep the command against coveting cost him is vividly portrayed in the seventh chapter of Romans.

Intensely zealous for the extermination of the Christians in order to vindicate the law, and crying out inwardly, "Oh wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?" because the law failed to satisfy his inner nature, Saul of Tarsus approached Damascus. Before he reached the city Christ appeared to him in that memorable vision—a vision which convinced him that Jesus was risen from the dead. This vision changed his whole life.

Why St. Paul's life was changed by this vision we can now understand. In common with other ancient peoples—Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans—the Hebrews believed that all the dead went down to a cavern under the earth. They called this "Sheol" (see Isa. 14:9 & Eze. 32:21-31). In the earlier

times the Hebrews had believed in no resurrection, but by the time of St. Paul a section of them, including the Pharisees, to which party he belonged, looked forward to a resurrection at a great day of judgment which was impending at some time in the future. In all history only two men had, they thought, escaped from Sheol in advance of this resurrection and gone direct to God. These were Enoch and Elijah. Among the Greeks and Babylonians, when mortals escaped the underworld they were thought to become gods. To the monotheistic Hebrews this was impossible; but they did the next best thing. Enoch was made an angel; the very process by which it was done is described to us in one of the apocalypses (Slav. Enoch 22). Elijah meantime had become a kind of heavenly patron saint, whose revelations and mediation accomplished the most marvellous wonders (cf. Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. V, 124 ff.).

When, therefore, Saul's vision convinced him that God had honored Jesus as He had honored Enoch and Elijah, in spite of the fact that the curse of the law rested upon Him in consequence of His crucifixion, his whole education had prepared him as naturally for the revulsion which followed as it had prepared him to be a persecutor. God could not have honored one whose life had been a lie; therefore Jesus must be the Messiah, as He had claimed. The Messiah was a heavenly being closely associated with God (Eth. Enoch 48-51); Jesus must accordingly be such a being. This was to him proof that Jesus was Divine (Rom. 1:4). St. Paul therefore became an ardent disciple of Him whom he had just now persecuted. This had a remarkable effect upon his inner life, the results of which we shall trace presently.

This vision of St. Paul's which had convinced him of the Messiahship of Jesus, had also a revolutionary effect upon his estimate of the Jewish law. That law had pronounced Jesus accursed because of His crucifixion; God, on the other hand, had honored Jesus as in all the history of the world he had honored only Enoch and Elijah and by so approving him had vindicated the Messianic claim of Jesus as well as his righteousness. The law could not therefore be, as St. Paul had thought, of universal

application. There must be a region—the region in which Jesus dwelt—in which it was not in force. As St. Paul had previously reasoned that Christians shared the curse of the crucified, so now he reasoned that they shared with Jesus his exemption from the law, and shared also his righteousness. It was because of this line of thought that Paul could say, "I through the law died to the law that I might live unto God" (Gal. 2:19). It was possible for a man to be justified now—i. e., pronounced righteous or acquitted, *hisdîk,* from the faults the Law had counted up against him—apart from the works of the law. God had revealed "a righteousness apart from the law" (Rom. 3:21). It was in this way that St. Paul saw that when a Jew became a Christian he need no longer keep the Jewish law. Similarly, he saw that if a Gentile became a Christian, he, too, could find access to God, apart from the law. To the Pharisee it was impossible for a Gentile to approach God without becoming a proselyte and keeping the law. The law was to the Pharisee the one avenue of approach to God and through it both Jew and Gentile must walk, if they would come near to him. St. Paul now saw a path of approach to God for the Gentiles apart from the law, if Gentiles identified themselves with Jesus. Gentiles even could share the favor of God bestowed on Jesus, in spite of the curse of the law. The bond written in ordinances—that is, the requirements of the Jewish law—which was contrary to us—which was a middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile—Jesus has taken out of the way, St. Paul declares, nailing it to his cross (Col. 2:13, 14). It was thus that St. Paul obtained his Gospel for the Gentiles, and became the Apostle to the Gentiles. It was for this reason that go where he would, let him but preach to the Jews and sooner or later a mob drove him away. His message was subversive of fundamental Jewish institutions.

We have thus briefly traced from St. Paul's Rabbinical training the rise of his Rabbinical philosophy.[1] It was to him as real

[1] All St. Paul's illustrations, except the two sacrificial ones fit into this system of thought; see his analogy of the married woman, Romans 7:1-6, though he reverses it in the application.

as the doctrine of decrees to a Calvinist, or the doctrine of evolution to a thinker of the present day. It was the Jewish philosophy of the time, and it could but have a fundamental influence upon him. It is, as will be shown presently, but half his thought, or not even that. It made him a persecutor, however; it helped to make him a Christian; it made him the Apostle to the Gentiles.

When St. Paul speaks of the death of Christ he has, except in a few rare instances, this philosophy in mind. Christ died but once, and that was on the cross; his blood was shed but once, and that was on the cross. Whether he speaks of the death of Christ, the shedding of the blood of Christ, or the crucifixion of Christ, he always has this Rabbinic sort of a philosophy in mind. Men ignorant of this philosophy have thought they found in St. Paul a doctrine of vicarious substitution, and have proclaimed this as the heart of St. Paul's Christian message. In reality the doctrine of vicarious substitution is as foreign to St. Paul as the doctrine of evolution is. The Rabbinic philosophy which has been mistaken for substitution is not even the heart of St. Paul's system. It was only the axe which cleared away the forests of Jewish particularism, that the seed of the kingdom might find a lodgment.

Into the system of thought here outlined the word ἱλαστήριον (Rom. 3:25), usually translated "propitiation," exactly fits, when properly translated. The word (ἱλαστήριον) occurs twenty-six times in the Septuagint and is always used to designate a place, never an offering. In twenty of these instances it translates the Hebrew *kappōreth,* which denotes the cover or lid of the Ark of the Covenant, and which our English version translates "mercy-seat" (Ex. 25:16-21; 31:7; 35:12; 38:5-8; Lev. 16:2; 13-15 & Nu. 7:89); five times in the forty-third chapter of Ezekiel it is a translation of *ʿazārā,* a part of the altar, i. e., the enclosure or "ledge" which surrounded it. The only other instance of the use of the word in the Septuagint is in Amos 9:1, where the Masoretic Text *hakkaphtōr,* which, by a metathesis of radicals to which Hebrew is not infrequently subjected in copying, read in the exemplar employed by the Greek translators *hakkeppōreth.* In the Greek Old Testament, then, which St. Paul not only used

but knew almost by heart, ἱλαστήριον always meant a place as it does in Hebrews 9:5, its only other occurrence in the New Testament—a place where forgiveness might be obtained. That he himself employed it in that sense in Romans 3:25 there can, I think, in the face of the evidence adduced, be no doubt. It should never have been translated "propitiation," but "mercy-seat."[1] St. Paul's thought is that God, by permitting Jesus to be crucified and incur the curse of the Law and then raising him from the dead, had broken through the hedge of the Law and established a mercy-seat apart from the Law. It was thus that God could be δίκαιον, i. e., *sadîk,* "conforming to law," or "law-abiding," or "right,"[2] and at the same time the δικαιοῦντα, i. e., the *masdîk,* i. e., "the just administrator of law" as in 2 Samuel 15:4 and Psalm 82:1(2), or one who, according to law, pronounces a defendant innocent.

[1] Deissmann, *Bible Studies,* 124-235, enters into a long argument to prove that ἱλαστήριον did not mean "the cover of the ark" or "mercy-seat," and adduces a passage from Josephus, *Antiquities,* XI, 7, 1, where a white stone is said to have been a ἱλαστήριον μνῆμα, and two inscriptions from Cos in proof of it. His argument, however, in no way conflicts with the conclusions reached above, for in the passages which he cites ἱλαστήριον is an adjective describing a stone or an object and not a sacrifice. To the testimony adduced above the fact should be added that Symmachus in Genesis 6:16 renders the Hebrew *tebah,* "ark"—the ark of Noah by ἱλαστήριον—again applying it to an object which occupies space, and not to a sacrifice. Boissacq in his etymological dictionary derives the cognate verb from a stem which means "to make oneself favorable," and early uses of the verb in such passages as the *Iliad,* II, 550 bear this meaning out. All of these facts tend to establish the conclusion that St. Paul regarded Christ as a God-appointed place where forgiveness might be obtained rather than a sacrifice.

As to the original meaning of the word *kappōreth,* the discussion of the late G. Buchanan Gray in his *Sacrifice in the Old Testament,* 67 ff., should be consulted. Gray has summarized the discussions of the last forty years. The question is whether the root *kāphăr* is to be connected with the Arabic *kafara,* "cover," or with the Akkadian *kapāru,* "wipe away" and the Syriac *kaphar,* "cleanse." Gray seems inclined to lean to the meaning "wipe away." The present writer, however, believes that Hebrew usage points to kinship in meaning with Arabic rather than with the Akkadian and Syriac. In some striking instances the same root has different meanings in Akkadian and Hebrew. Thus *amaru* means in Akkadian "see"; *âmăr* in Hebrew, "say." Moreover the use of *kappōreth* as the lid or cover of the ark is a strong argument in favor of the meaning "cover" for *kāphăr.*

[2] Cf. Isaiah 41:26.

Such was the Rabbinic reasoning by which St. Paul interpreted the death of Christ. His thought moved in the region of the Law, the gibbet, and legal relations, not in the realm of the altar and sacrifice. Practically every phrase that he employs fits into this system. The unspeakable goodness of Christ in voluntarily submitting to the horrible death of the Cross to accomplish this end deeply touched his heart. "He loved me and gave Himself up for me" made to St. Paul an appeal which controlled his whole life. When one's attention is called to the matter it is surprising that the idea of ritual sacrifice in any form is so wholly absent from St. Paul's interpretation of Christ's death. But two sacrificial figures are applied to Christ in all his Epistles and one of these is in Ephesians, the Pauline authorship of which is increasingly doubted by scholars.[1] In his first Epistle to the Corinthians, writing about the time of the Passover, he said, "Christ our Passover hath been sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. 5:7). In Ephesians 5:2 he says that Christ gave himself up for us "an offering and a sacrifice (*προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν*), an odor of a sweet smell." How little theological significance is to be attached to this, even if the Epistle be St. Paul's, may be learned from Philippians 4:18, where he applies almost the same language to a gift of money sent to him by the Philippian Church. He says it was "an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice (*θυσίαν*) acceptable, well pleasing to God." These two sacrificial figures are but the momentary application of illustrations. They are like his statement that the Israelites were baptised unto Moses in the Red Sea, when they did not get wet at all. The warp and woof of his thinking lay in the region of the Cross, the curse, the Law, and the Resurrection.

The real gospel of St. Paul—his powerful conception of the Christian message which enabled him to do his work—was his doctrine of the mystic union of Christ and the believer. Indeed with St. Paul this was more than a doctrine; it was a living experience. The recognition of this brings us to another aspect of

[1] For a summary of opinion, see Moffatt, *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 373 ff. Moffatt himself does not regard it as an Epistle of St. Paul.

St. Paul's vision near Damascus. We have traced its influence on his thought, but it had also a creative effect on his heart-life.

We know that this is true from the way in which St. Paul always referred to this experience. He speaks of it in Galatians 1 : 16 as God revealing his Son in me. In Romans 7 and 8 he contrasts the old life under the law with the fact that " the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." In Galatians 2 : 20 he declares " It is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me."

In this experience St. Paul's thirst for righteousness found satisfaction. The control of his desires which he was unable to accomplish alone, and which made him cry out so pathetically, " Who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? " was now accomplished by union with the indwelling Christ, so that he could sing, " There is therefore now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." This mystic union with Christ, which had given his own life such emancipation, such poise and power, was the heart of his Christian message.

St. Paul was a many-sided man. He was deeply mystical in religion, sternly logical as an interpreter of the Law, and possessed withal a vivid imagination, to which, in driving home the truths he would teach, he often gave free play in calling up telling illustrations.

III

But little space is left for the rest of the New Testament, but the teaching of St. Peter, of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and of the author of the Fourth Gospel concerning the death of Christ must be touched upon. The significant passage from St. Peter on this subject is found in 1 Peter 2 : 24, where it is said of Christ: " Who his own self bare our sins in his body

upon the tree (ὅς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτος ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον), that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness, by whose stripes ye were healed." Professor Deissmann has pointed out [1] that the phrase ἀνήνεγκεν επὶ τὸ ξύλον is shown by an Egyptian papyrus in the Petrie Collection, dating from the year 230 B. C. to be a legal expression for attaching blame, or transferring blame, and that the passage accordingly means that he transferred the blame of our sins to the Cross. It is a bold figure, and reminds Deissmann of St. Paul's bold figure in Colossians 2: 14, "He hath blotted out the bond written in ordinances, which was against us, which was contrary to us: and hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." The discovery of the legal phrase makes Deissmann think that St. Peter was speaking as St. Paul spoke. It is quite true that in the last part of the verse St. Peter's reference to dying unto sins and living unto righteousness sets forth the mystic side of St. Paul's Gospel, that the death and resurrection of Christ are repeated in the inner experience of the believer (cf. Gal. 2: 20 & Rom. 6: 3, 4, etc.). It would seem that St. Peter held not only to the mystical part of St. Paul's interpretation of our Lord's death, but to the Rabbinic part as well. This is what we might expect. The Galilean fisherman was not himself trained to Rabbinic interpretation, but he had grown up under the general influence of Pharisaism, and, after St. Paul had developed and taught his interpretation of the emancipation that the Cross had wrought from the Law, and the way Christians should in experience die and rise again with Christ, St. Peter would be prepared to accept both. So, although he adds a reference to the Suffering Servant of Isaiah, which he had learned to do from Christ Himself, his interpretation is in reality the same as St. Paul's.[2]

[1] *Bible Studies*, Edinburgh, 1901, pp. 88-91.

[2] The comparison of the blood of Christ to the blood of a lamb without blemish in 1 Peter 1: 19 is but vaguely sacrificial. The figure is used to suggest the holiness of Christ. The reference to silver and gold in the preceding verse, together with the word "redeemed" shows that the figure is that of redeeming a captive rather than offering a ritual sacrifice.

IV

While one aspect of the thought of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews indicates some affinity to the thought of St. Paul (Heb. 13: 11-13), in reality he struck out a line of interpretation that was new. Whoever he was he had come under the influence of Philo, and at times one can detect echoes of Philo's phrases, as e. g., in 4: 12 f. He belonged to the second generation of Christians, to whom the thought of the Cross was not so repulsive as to the first, since they had become more accustomed to think of it. He probably came from the Dispersion, where the rigid legal interpretation of Palestinian Pharisaical Rabbis was not so closely followed. By the aid of Philonic allegory he portrays Christ as a great High Priest, after the order of Melchisedek, superior to the Aaronic priesthood, who offered Himself as a sacrifice, entering Heaven, the real Holy of Holies, with his own blood—a sacrifice so perfect that henceforth no other sacrifice is necessary. He contrasts Christ's one entrance into the Holy of Holies with the annual entrance of the high priest into the holy of holies in the Temple, tells us that Christ was manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself, and that He was offered to bear the sins of many (Heb. 9: 11 & 10: 20). The allusions here are to the ritual of the Day of Atonement in Leviticus 16, but they are of the vaguest kind. In that ritual two goats were selected, one for Yahweh and one for Azazel; with his hands on the head of Azazel's goat the high priest made confession in Yahweh's presence, of his own sins and those of the people, and then sent him out into the wilderness where Azazel, a wilderness demon, could catch him. It is an old and primitive ritual, which was re-adapted to the needs of post-exilic Judaism. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews makes no allusion to the goat for Azazel. He does not tell us just how Christ's sacrifice takes away our sins. Advocates of the theory of vicarious piacular sacrifice have often blended the two goats in Leviticus and made them both types of Christ, but there is no reason to suppose that the writer of the Epistle did

this. He was content with the general analogy, and by means of it lifted the thought of his readers from the Levitical high priest, the slain animal, and the earthly Temple to the eternal Christ, his availing sacrifice, and to heaven.

In passing it is worthy of note that the author of this Epistle is the only New Testament writer beside St. Paul to use the word ἱλαστήριον, and he employs it (Heb. 9:5) as St. Paul does in its Septuagintal meaning of "mercy-seat." In translating him the makers of our English Versions have so rendered it.

One expression of the author of this Epistle has often been popularly misinterpreted. That is "apart from shedding of blood there is no remission." Interpreted by its context this does not mean, as preachers have sometimes inferred, that, unless Christ's blood had been shed, God could not have forgiven sin. The verse must be taken as a whole: "And according to the law, I may almost say, all things are cleansed with blood, and apart from shedding of blood there is no remission." The writer was not speaking of Christianity but of Judaism, and he says frankly that his statement was an exaggeration even of Judaism.

With the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews the interpretation of Christ's death as a ritual sacrifice, which has since played such a large part in Christian thinking definitely enters into Christian thought.

V

The author of the Fourth Gospel enters into no interpretation of the death of Christ. He holds with the other New Testament writers that the death of our Lord somehow is connected with the forgiveness of sin, but he nowhere explains it as he does the Incarnation and the Eucharist. Other problems were to the fore when he wrote at Ephesus, and the understanding of our

Lord's death was not to him the vital problem that it was to St. Paul. The bonds of Judaism had been broken; the rift between Church and Synagogue was complete; Jews were among the bitterest opponents of Christianity; and this writer conceived it to be his task to give the Person of Christ a universal—a cosmic—interpretation. Nevertheless he applies five figures or comparisons to our Lord's death, each one of which is suggestive.

The first of these is found in John 1, where the writer tells us that on two successive days (see vs. 29 & 35) John the Baptist said of Jesus, "Behold, the Lamb of God," once adding, "which taketh away the sin of the world." The lamb was one of the commonest offerings in Hebrew ritual. The burnt offering which was offered every day in the Temple at morning and at evening was a lamb (Ex. 29: 38-41) and lambs were offered in profusion at the great festivals (cf. Nu. 28 & 29), but in the great majority of instances they were eucharistic offerings to Jehovah (Yahweh). Doubtless they were thought to constitute that "odour of a sweet smell" which made him feel good natured and forgiving, but they were in no sense piacular. Sometimes a lamb was prescribed as a "sin offering" or "trespass offering" (*'ashmā*), which was not a sin-offering at all in our sense of the word sin, but only an offering to remove the consequences of the violation of a taboo—a violation that might have been unconsciously committed. Such offerings were so rare in comparison with the use of the lamb in the daily offering that the association of the word was predominantly with the daily eucharistic sacrifice. As applied to our Lord then it would mean that He was the offering that was acceptable to God. Indeed it seems probable that in employing the figure of the lamb the writer meant to emphasize the purity of Christ quite as much as His sacrificial work, for in 1 John 3: 5 he says, "Ye know that He was manifested to take away sins, and in Him is no sin." Whether, however, he was thinking of the death of the Lamb or the purity of the Lamb, the figure is drawn from the use of lambs in sacrifice.

The second is the figure of the "lifting up" of Christ: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the

Son of Man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life" (Jno. 3:14, 15); "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me" (Jno. 12:32). The first of these passages suggests a parallel between the lifting up of the brazen serpent on a standard (Nu. 21:8, 9) and the lifting up of Christ upon the Cross. The second of them might refer to the Ascension, and in the judgment of some scholars does so refer, but either the author or an editor has added in the next verse the comment: "This he said signifying by what manner of death he should die," thus making it also refer to the Cross. Unless we are prepared to champion a composite theory of the origin of the Gospel (a hazardous procedure), we must understand the words to refer to the Cross. Both passages then interpret the Cross simply as the instrument whereby Christ is brought to the attention of men. Salvation is said to depend on faith in him.

In John 10 the author represents Jesus as the Good Shepherd who gives his life for his sheep. The figure implies no offering to God; the life is given, as the life of any shepherd might be given, in the struggle to save his sheep from one who would rob him of them.

Again in 1 John 1:7 he says: "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." The use of the word "blood" here might by itself be interpreted either in the Pauline sense, or in that of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In view, however, of the suggestions of the word "lamb," we should probably take it in a sacrificial sense.

The fifth and final figure of this writer is found in his twice repeated statement that Christ is the ἱλασμός for our sins (1 Jno. 2:2 & 4:10). This word, ἱλασμός, which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, occurs some ten times in the Septuagint, once as the translation of *'ashmāh* (Amos 8:14), where *'ashmā* means "guilt," but was mistaken by the translators for "guilt-offering"; once (Eze. 44:27), for *ḥatath*, "sin-offering"; twice for *kippurim*, "covering" or "forgivenesses" (Lev. 25:9 & Nu. 5:8); and once for *s^{e}lī^{h}a*, "forgiveness" (Ps. 129:4; cf. Heb. 130:4).

(The other occurrences are in apocryphal books, of which the Hebrew has not survived.)[1] Whether any or all these meanings were in the mind of the Jewish author of the Fourth Gospel, it is difficult to say. He had been, as his Gospel shows, subjected to other than Hebrew influences. The word ἱλασμός was employed in classical Greek to designate "a means of appeasing," "a propitiation," or a "sacrifice." It is also found in papyri in the sense of "propitiation,"[2] "atonement." The root appears in the verb ἱλάσκεσθαι in Homer (Iliad A, 472; B, 550), in the sense of "reconcile one's self to," "make propitious," "appease."[3] Both the Jewish and Greek associations of the word denote, accordingly, the same idea. To determine how profoundly the thought of propitiation entered into the mind of the writer of the Fourth Gospel, we should consider his thought as a whole.

When we review the thought of the author of the Fourth Gospel in its entirety, it becomes evident that, while he gives to the death of Christ the place in Christian thought, which, at the time he wrote, had become traditionally fixed, he did not regard Christ as having offered a propitiatory offering to God, or as having wrought by his death a change in the attitude of God toward the world. On the contrary, he believed that the coming of Christ had been accomplished at the Father's behest. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life" (Jno. 3:16). "Herein was the love of God manifested in us, that God hath sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." He "sent His Son to be the propitiation (ἱλασμός) for our sins." "We love, because he first loved us" (1 John 4:9, 10, 19). It is evident, therefore, that in the thought of this writer, "propitiation" connoted something quite different from

[1] The Greek text of Sir. 32 (35):5 does not represent the known Hebrew text of the passage.

[2] Cf. the references in Preisigke's *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden,* Heidelberg, 1924, col. 695.

[3] Cf. Keep's *Homeric Dictionery,* New York, 1887, p. 157. In Iliad B, 550 the verb appears as ἱλάονται. For its varying forms in Greek dialects, and for a possible etymology, see Boisacq's *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque,* Heidelberg, 1923, p. 373.

that which it did either to primitive men or to the Hebrews of the Old Testament period. The five figures which the writer employs show that he interpreted the fact of our Lord's crucifixion in his own way and accepted in a general way our Lord's death as a sacrifice.

It must be recognized, however, that the writer's understanding of Christian life and of Christian theology caused him to be much more interested in establishing the pre-existence of our Lord, the reality of his incarnation, and the importance of the mystic experiences of the new birth and fellowship with Christ in life—a fellowship which gave the believer a Chrism (χρίσμα), a bit of the nature of Christ (χριστός)—than in Christ's death. The function of our Lord's death, as it had come to be traditionally interpreted, he perpetuates, but he places the main emphasis of his teaching on other things.

We have not spoken of the place of the death of Christ in the early Apostolic preaching as reflected in the early chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, nor of the conceptions of Christ's death reflected in the Book of Revelation, but the five strata of New Testament thought, upon which we have touched, contain the most definite teaching upon the subject.

VI

In conclusion, it should be noted that in our Lord's own teaching, that which refers to his death constitutes but a small fraction of the whole. The great burden of his utterances is occupied with teaching about the Father, the Kingdom of God, and the secret of life with God. Only as the end approached and the shadow of the Cross began to fall across his pathway did he begin to speak of his death; and of the sayings then uttered, only two give us any inkling as to the place of his death in God's plan for the world. As we have seen, even in these two the vague figures

employed, while they assert the fact that it was for others, leave the how and why of it unexplained.

To St. Paul, as has been pointed out, the peculiar method of Christ's death coupled with his resurrection, opened a way of escape from the Law, which, as a Rabbi, he believed to be from God. This made the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Jesus overshadow, in St. Paul's thought, every other event in his life, and accounts for the peculiar emphasis which St. Paul puts upon them. Perhaps it was this also that led the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews to interpret that death as a ritual sacrifice, and to sum up the whole work of our Lord in the offering of a sacrifice once for all.

The author of the Fourth Gospel restores again the balance of the different parts of our Lord's life, presenting the death in proper perspective of the whole, but emphasizing particularly the Divine Sonship of Christ and the love of God revealed in him.

Although the death of Christ may be taken out of proper perspective and made to eclipse other aspects of his being and career, it is nevertheless the most appealing part of that matchless life, and stands for one of the central truths of Christianity. Here Christianity links itself up with the pain and tragedy of the world in a way that meets man's deepest need. Buddhism and other religions of India, for example, are helpless in the face of pain and death. They can only say that life itself is an evil and seek for deliverance from conscious existence. It is due to the Cross of Christ that Christianity faces this pain and tragedy, finds in it a way to share the life of God, and so to enter through pain and the Cross into an abundant life of peace, labor, triumph and blessedness. Though a satisfactory theory may not have been evolved to explain it, many can make their own the words of Harry Webb Farrington in the second stanza of the Harvard prize hymn:

"I know not how that Calvary's Cross
A world from sin could free;
I only know its matchless Love
Has brought God's Love to me."

CHAPTER VI

THE EUCHARIST[1]

This chapter is an objective study of New Testament facts. Such inferences only are drawn from the facts as seem to be warranted by the approved principles of historical investigation.

The New Testament material on the subject yields us information concerning the Eucharist at three different points of the Apostolic Age: its institution by our Lord in the year 30 A. D.; the Eucharist as celebrated at Corinth and as treated by St. Paul in the decade 50-60 A. D.; and the Eucharist as it was valued and interpreted by the author of the Gospel of John at Ephesus about 90-120 A. D. The problems connected with each of these three periods are of a somewhat complicated nature. Obviously in the limits allowed me no thorough treatment of any one of these periods is possible. The most that can be done is to state the most salient facts of each of these historical situations and briefly to indicate the conclusion to which these facts point.

I

We begin, then, with the Institution of the Eucharist by our Lord. As the text of the New Testament stands, we have four accounts of the acts and words of our Lord at the Last Supper which have a bearing on the Institution, though a closer examination reduces these to three. The report which most scholars regard as the earliest comes from St. Paul. It is found in 1 Corinthians

[1] Read at the Conference of the Church League held in St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia, February 15-16, 1927.

11:23-26 and was written in 55 or 56 A. D., about twenty-five years after our Lord's Crucifixion. It tells us that in the night in which He was betrayed, Jesus took bread and, when He had blessed it, He brake it and said: "This is my body, which is for you. This do for my remembrance." Authorities which are as old as the fourth century make the sentence read: "This is my body which is broken for you," and prefix the words: "Take, eat." The genuine words of St. Paul continue: "Likewise also after supper, the cup, saying, 'this cup is the new covenant in my blood; this do, as oft as ye drink, unto my remembrance, for as oft as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye proclaim the death of the Lord until he come.'" It is probable that the last sentences are the words of St. Paul, not of Christ.

The Gospel according to St. Mark (ch. 14:22-25) gives us our next earliest account of the Institution. In the opinion of most scholars it dates from ten to fifteen years later than St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, though others think it possible that the first edition of it was issued from five to ten years earlier than that Epistle. St. Mark tells us that as they were eating Jesus took bread, and when he had blessed it he brake it and said: "Take, this is my body. And taking the cup, when he had given thanks, he gave to them and they all drank of it. And he said to them: This is the blood of my covenant, which is poured out for many: verily I say to you that I will not again drink of the product of the vine until that day, when I drink it new in the kingdom of God." St. Matthew's account, it is unanimously agreed by scholars, is based upon that of St. Mark. St. Matthew varies from St. Mark in no substantial fact. Such differences as he presents are only verbal editorial changes. He tells us, for example, that when Jesus handed the bread to the disciples, he not only said: "Take," but "Take, eat." He changes: "They all drank of it," to: "Drink ye all of it." He also adds the words: "for the remission of sins" to the words: "This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many." Otherwise St. Matthew but repeats the account which St. Mark had given.

The striking feature of this Marcan account, which may go back to St. Peter and may have been written earlier than St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, is that it contains no command to repeat the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine. Neither St. Mark nor St. Matthew contains any hint that our Lord's command: "Take, eat," and "Drink ye all of it" referred to any other occasion than the night of the Last Supper itself.

The Gospel according to St. Luke contains still another account of the Last Supper, and one which recent investigation has demonstrated came from a separate Jerusalem source independent of St. Mark. One theory is that this source was composed by a Jerusalem Christian about 45 A. D.; another that it was compiled perhaps 58-60 A. D. by St. Luke himself, as a part of his first attempt at Gospel-writing and was afterward incorporated by him in his Gospel. This last view is advocated by two English scholars, one of whom is Canon Streeter of Oxford. This source, in what is supposed to be its original form, reads: "And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this and divide it among yourselves. And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it and gave to them, saying, This is my body." So much only do scholars generally allow to have been in this source from the beginning. All existing MSS. except those that Westcott and Hort called "Western," follow the words quoted by others, so that the last part of the passage reads as follows: "This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood—that which is poured out for you," but these added words form one of the passages which Westcott and Hort believed had been interpolated into all manuscripts except the "Western" and which in consequence they called "Western non-interpolation." [1] Most students of the text since the days of Westcott and Hort have not ventured to dissent from their judgment. Such dissenters as have appeared (e. g., Blass [2] and Monks [3]) have not attempted to prove that the omitted

[1] See their *Introduction*, pp. 175-177.
[2] *Philology of the Gospels*, London, 1898, p. 179 ff.
[3] *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. XLIV (1925), p. 242 ff.

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

words formed a part of the pre-Lucan source. They seem to take it for granted that St. Luke added them, when composing his Gospel, either from the passage in 1 Corinthians, or from the Christian practice of the time. If this be so, our only witness that our Lord uttered any command to repeat the Last Supper would be St. Paul. This need not trouble us, however. St. Paul was at Jerusalem in conference with St. Peter within the first decade after the Crucifixion, and perhaps within five years after it (Gal. 1 : 18), and his testimony is good and sufficient.

The historical fact is, therefore, that our Lord in distributing the broken bread used the mystic metaphor: "This is my body," and in passing the cup he said: "This is the blood of my covenant," or: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood. This do in my remembrance,"—words which show that, just as Exodus 24: 1-11 portrays the sealing of the covenant between God and Israel by the body and blood of a sacrifice, so he regarded his own death as sealing a new covenant. He further directed his disciples to "do this" in his "remembrance." There is no hint that the repetition was a repetition of the sacrifice; it was only a memorial that a sacrifice had once been offered. To interpret our Lord's words to mean more than this, is to read into them that which is not there.

II

The second glimpse of the Eucharist which the New Testament affords is in St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, written about 55-56 A. D. The abuses which the Corinthians had allowed to creep into the celebration of the Eucharist, and the means by which St. Paul in the eleventh chapter of this Epistle sought to correct these, prove that up to this time the Eucharist had been celebrated as a real social meal. Since, however, the Corinthians had robbed it of its fraternal significance by break-

ing up the company into groups, each of which had a separate meal of different quality, St. Paul directed that hereafter the real meal should be eaten at home, and that the Sacrament should be celebrated only by a symbol of a meal. He thus introduced a reform, which though not everywhere immediately adopted, gradually prevailed and made the celebration of the Eucharist in course of time what it is to-day. That for a time the Eucharist continued in some localities to be a real meal is implied by the phrase with which the tenth chapter of the Didache opens. Those words are: "After you have been satisfied with food," and imply that the directions given concerning the cup and the bread in chapter nine refer to the ritual with which this common meal began, and that those which follow in chapter ten refer to the ritual with which the meal was concluded. In the end, however, the form of celebration recommended by St. Paul to the Corinthians prevailed.

With reference to St. Paul's utterances concerning the Eucharist two questions arise: was he influenced to any degree by the Mystery Religions? And: did he hold, as advocates of transubstantiation have believed, that the bread became the actual body of the Lord?

With reference to the first of these questions it has been sometimes suggested that St. Paul's direction that those who were hungry should satisfy their hunger at home, which reduced the Eucharistic meal to a symbol, was dictated by his desire to make the Christian Eucharist conform to the sacramental meals of the Mystery Religions. This claim cannot be substantiated, for the feasts of the Mystery Religions belonged generally to the part of their ritual which was kept secret, and the details of which at present seem to be mostly undiscoverable.

The Mystery Religions were of two classes: the old Greek Mysteries of Dionysos, Demeter and Orpheus, which emerged in the sixth century before Christ, and which were dying out in the time of St. Paul. The one bit of pertinent evidence which we have concerning the feasts of these older mysteries comes from an inscription dated 91 B. C., which gives some details of the Mys-

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

teries at Adania in Messenia in the Southern Poloponnesus.[1] According to this inscription a hundred lambs were offered in sacrifice, and the remains of the sacrifice were consumed by the worshippers in a feast. The remains of a hundred lambs would certainly constitute a fairly substantial meal capable of satisfying hunger! Even supposing that St. Paul knew the secrets of these older Mystery Religions, the little that we know of their feasts affords no ground for the opinion that St. Paul's reform in the method of celebrating the Eucharist was suggested by them.

That he knew that there were feasts connected with heathen worship he gives us proof in 1 Corinthians 10:20. To partake of such sacrifices at one of their sacrificial meals was, he declared, to commune with a demon. Such sacrificial feasts were universal in the ancient world. Inscriptions from many countries as well as many ancient historians testify to them. They were matters of common knowledge. An Egyptian papyrus of the second century shows that people invited guests to such sacred feasts and that they were sometimes held in private houses. The food was probably carried from a neighboring temple by a kind of "Reservation." Probably it was against such feasts that St. Paul warns Christians in 1 Corinthians 10:20-22.

There was, however, a group of Mystery Religions which sprang up later—those of Cybele, Isis and Mithra. Although the worship of Cybele reached Ostia in 205 B. C., its frenzied ceremonies were generally repugnant to the Roman people and it was not until the reign of Claudius, 41-54 A. D., that it received legal recognition and started on its career in Italy as a popular cult. It had, however, become popular in Greece and in some of the eastern provinces earlier, and may have been well known in Celicia and the Province of Asia before St. Paul's time. The one thing known about the feasts of the Mysteries of Cybele is that initiates ate from a drum and drank from a cymbal,[2] but whether they ate

[1] H. Sauppe, *Die Mysterieninschrift von Adania*, Göttingen, 1860; cf. C. T. Newton, *Essays on Art and Archæology*, London, 1880, pp. 177-184, and P. Gardner in Encyc. of Rel. & Ethics, Vol. IX, p. 79.

[2] Cf. S. Angus, *The Mystery Religions and Christianity*, New York, 1926, p. 60; also, Hugo Hepding, *Attis seine Mythen and seine Kult*, Giessen, 1903, pp. 147-176.

symbolically or had a "square" meal we are not told. The Isis cult had been introduced by the Ptolemies into the countries bordering on the Eastern Mediterranean, but until after the middle of the first century of our era Isis was the patroness of prostitutes. After that someone did rescue-work upon her and Isis became a virgin goddess, and her cult highly ethical, but her feasts appear always to have been real feasts, to which one could invite a guest as to a dinner. There is not only nothing in the celebration of the Eucharist as ordained by St. Paul suggesting influence from these sources, but the tone of 1 Corinthians 10: 20-22 indicates that any semblance to these would have been abhorrent to him. As for the cult of Mithra it appears to have been brought by soldiers from Parthia and cannot be traced in the Roman Empire until some sixteen years after the First Epistle to the Corinthians was written. Justin Martyr, a hundred years later (First Apol. ch. 66), says that wicked demons imitated the Christian Eucharist by making the eating of bread and the drinking of a cup of water a part of the initiatory rites of the Mysteries of Mithra, and it is clear, from the historical facts just stated, that, if there was any borrowing here, it must have been on the part of Mithraism and not on the part of Christianity.[1]

This brings us to the second question: Did St. Paul think of the Eucharist as an actual partaking of the real body and blood of Christ? Is there latent in his words a doctrine of transubstantiation? One phrase in 1 Corinthians 11: 29 might seem to lend itself to that view: "He that eateth and drinketh eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, not discerning the body." What does he mean here by "body"? To infer that he regarded the bread as the actual body of the Lord is to read into it the thought of a much later age. A sound exegetical method is to interpret the

[1] In reality there was no borrowing either way. The cup of water was the substitute for the native Persian cup of haoma, a sacred beverage in Zoroastrianism, as it had been in earlier Iranian heathenism, and which doubtless survived in Mithraism; see Hastings' *Encylcopædia of Religion and Ethics*, VI, 509b-510a & XI, 19a-20b. One would have expected wine rather than water to be employed as a substitute in countries where haoma could not be obtained, and one wonders if Justin was not mistaken in thinking it was water.

word "body" (σῶμα) here by St. Paul's use of it in connection with the Eucharist in chapter 10: 16, 17, where he says: "The bread which we break—is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For one bread, one body are we the many, for we all share in the one bread." (ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἓν σῶμα οἱ πολλοί ἐσμεν οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν.) It is clear from this language that St. Paul is employing the word "body" figuratively. The bread is a symbol of the body of Christ, but the whole company of believers are also his body. If there is transubstantiation in the one case, there is also in the other. In reality the bread is in his thought a symbol, by the partaking of which the body of Christians symbolizes the fellowship of its parts not only with Christ, but with one another. Thus in his discussion of the Eucharist St. Paul introduces the figure of the Church as an organic body—the body of Christ—which he develops more fully in chapters 11 and 12-14. There is, then, no hint that St. Paul thought of Christ as physically present in the Eucharist. Since he quotes as a part of Christ's words of institution: "This do, as oft as ye drink it, in my remembrance," he clearly thought of the Eucharist as a memorial. This is further made evident by his statement: "As oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye proclaim the Lord's death until he come." To St. Paul the Eucharist was a memorial. Zwingle's conception of the Eucharist was much nearer to that of St. Paul than was either that of Luther or of Radbertus.

It was to St. Paul, however, no light thing to recall the death of Christ. A thought which often finds expression on the pages of his Epistles is that real Christians go down with Christ to death—death to sin—and rise with Him to a new life of righteousness. It was this which made them members of the Lord's body. To partake of the symbols which proclaimed the Lord's death, while not living the Lord's life—while in reality not a member of the Lord's body—was to fail to "discern the body." Such a one condemned himself as a hypocrite, bringing on himself guilt and condemnation. To enter into full sympathy with the memorial Eucharist was for a real Christian to proclaim: "I have been crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. 2: 20).

III

During the forty to seventy years between St. Paul and the Fourth Gospel a profound change of thought swept over the Church—or at least over certain portions of it—with reference to the Eucharist, a change against which the author of the Fourth Gospel felt himself called upon to protest. To those who dip below the surface of the Fourth Gospel his protest is very clear, though it has only become evident to scholars within the last twenty years. In order to understand the teaching of the Fourth Gospel with reference to the Eucharist the Church's change of thought must be understood.

St. Paul's ordinary conception of the death of Christ was, as shown in the preceding chapter, not the sacrificial conception. Christ died on the Cross, and the Cross was generally in St. Paul's mind, when he spoke of the death of Christ. The Cross did not suggest to him an altar any more than an electric chair suggests to us a Communion Table. Only twice in his Epistles does he apply sacrificial terms to the death of Christ, and one of these is in an Epistle the Pauline authorship of which is in doubt—Ephesians. Once he says: "Our Passover hath been sacrificed, even Christ" (1 Cor. 5:7). Again, in Ephesians 5:2 he says: "Christ gave himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice (*προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν*) to God, for an odor of a sweet smell." We know, however, even if Ephesians be really a letter of St. Paul, that the figure was in his mind but a fleeting figure without theological significance, for in Philippians 4:18 he says that the gift of money which the Philippians sent him at Rome was "an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice (*θυσίαν*) acceptable, well pleasing to God." St. Paul clearly did not think of the death of Christ in the terms of a ritual sacrifice, and consequently could not think of the memorial meal in such terms.

With the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, however, a change began. He belonged to the second generation of Christians; he stood at a greater distance than St. Paul from the horror and the disgrace of the Cross. In the effort to explain why Chris-

tians alone had no altar and no sacrifices, he allegorically portrayed Christ as: "A priest forever after the order of Melchizedek" and His death as a sacrifice made "once for all." The figure was one which appealed powerfully to men of all sorts, and thus the sacrificial interpretation of Christ's death, which he set forth, became the favorite interpretation of it in later generations.

Between St. Paul and the Fourth Gospel large numbers of Gentiles became Christians. From the sixth or fifth century before Christ men had been seeking individual immortality. Mysteries, whether those of Dionysos, Demeter, Orpheus or the later mysteries of Cybele, Isis or Mithra, promised immortality through sacramental union with the god. The sacramental food was believed to give the communicant a share of the god's life, so that, like the god, he became immortal. Thus the initiates of Cybele confessed that they had eaten from a drum and drunk from a cymbal and had thus become communicants of the god Attis. Such sacraments were to them the bread of life—eternal life. Men flocked to Christianity because it satisfied the longing for immortality—or gave greater promise of satisfying it—than did the Mystery Religions. Naturally such men thought of the elements of the Eucharist as the food which gave immortality.

To men seeking eternal life the author of the Fourth Gospel addressed himself. It is no accident that the term, "eternal life" (ζωὴ αἰώνιος), occurs twenty-three times in his writings, seventeen times in his Gospel and six in his First Epistle, whereas the phrase is found but eight times in the three Synoptic Gospels, and but nine times in all the Pauline Epistles. Addressing himself to such men, he emphasized the fact that Christ Himself is the genuine bread from heaven (ὁ ἄρτος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὁ ἀληθινός), whereof if a man eat, he shall not die. He is also at great pains, as we shall see in a moment, to distinguish this bread which came down from heaven from the elements of the Eucharist. We have evidence that between St. Paul and the Fourth Gospel the Eucharist had become a sacrifice, which could be offered only by the office-bearers in the Church. The fact that it was a sacrifice is witnessed to by

Ignatius, who may have been a contemporary of the author of the Fourth Gospel, who says in Philippians 4, that there is one Eucharist, one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, one union with his blood, one altar (θυσιαστήριον) and one bishop. He further says in Smyrneaus 8: "Let that be a valid Eucharist which is celebrated by the bishop or by one whom he appoints." That this was the general Christian custom in the first half of the second century is vouched for by Justin Martyr who says that the bread and wine were blessed by the President (προεστώς) and distributed to the congregation by the deacons (1 Apol. ch. 66). Ignatius in other passages appears to refer to the Eucharist as "the bread of God" (Eph. 5), and as "Christian fare" (Trallians 6), though this interpretation is not necessary. He may be speaking figuratively of sound doctrine.

Against this trend of thought and custom the author of the Fourth Gospel cast the whole weight of his influence. He retold the story of Christ's life and teaching in a way that, had it been understood and followed, would have stemmed the current of materialization of spiritual things, which had already gained such headway. His method was simple, but radical. He dropped from his account of the Lord's life all account of the Institution of the Eucharist, and substituted for it the washing of the Disciples' feet. Not a symbolic sacrifice, but an act of service was the Master's farewell legacy to the Disciples, this writer would teach us. Further, he connects our Lord's teaching concerning the Eucharist with the miracle of feeding the 5000, which there was no command to repeat, and which, in the nature of the case, the Disciples could not repeat. In his account of the miracle he changes the Synoptic accounts to make Christ Himself distribute the food to the multitude, that no disciple or office-bearer may be thought to come between the Master and the individual soul. Then he tells us that almost immediately after in the Synagogue in Capernaum Christ spoke to the people of the bread of life. In this discourse he tells us that the Master said: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood ye have not life in yourselves,"

but a little later he explains: "The flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life" (Jno. 6:63). Christ is the living bread which gives one immortality, but He is received not in symbolic elements which men, even though Apostles, could dispense, but by those who heed His words, catch His spirit and by it are quickened to that life which knows no end. Each disciple by believing is to receive an "anointing" (χρῖσαμ, a bit of the nature of χριστός), (1 Jno. 2:27). This, not the bread and wine, it is, he declares which gives eternal life.

This is the teaching of the great mystic who wrote this Gospel. He had himself met Christ in a mystic experience so real that he could say: "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you." He felt himself so enlightened by that Paraclete which had come to represent Christ, that he could utter with authority to the Church some of the many things that Jesus had to say, but which the Disciples could not bear when He was with them in the body. Such a direct experience of illumination and vitalizing gives one, he declares, eternal life. This is to partake of the Living Bread. Such an experience was, he believed, possible for every believer. To such Communion, he tells us, Christ calls men. To have this experience is, he declares in substance, the real Communion—to celebrate the real Eucharist. By the whole arrangement of the material of his Gospel, its silences, its utterances and its emphases, he teaches in no uncertain way that, in his opinion, the Eucharist as celebrated in his time, with its altar and with the intervention of the office-bearers of the Church between Christ and the believer, was never instituted by our Lord. Just as the Prophet Amos declared (Amos 5:25) that sacrifice was no part of Yahweh's covenant with Israel, so the author of the Fourth Gospel declares in effect that the Eucharist, not only as a sacrifice, but as a memorial, was no part of the Lord's legacy to His Disciples.

In the Old Testament Amos and Isaiah had denounced ritual; the author of the Fourth Gospel portrays a religion above ritual and independent of it. Mystics in many lands and within the bounds of many religions have done the same. In the seventeenth

century George Fox and the early Friends followed in the footsteps of the author of the Fourth Gospel without knowing it. In reality religion cannot thrive and spread without some ritual. Something in our psychology demands it. The Quakers soon had a ritual, none the less real because its forms were traditional customs and its rubrics were unwritten.

The teaching of the author of the Fourth Gospel with reference to the Eucharist had little, if any, influence on the succeeding centuries. His Logos-doctrine shaped the Church's Christology, but his conception of what constitutes Communion passed unheeded. To the majority of people in any age a supposedly holy substance that can be grasped in the hand is more welcome than a summons to the heights of spiritual endeavor. It is easier to revere the bone of a saint than to lead a saintly life, to venerate a bit of the true Cross than to tread in the Master's footsteps to Calvary, to carry a bit of bread and wine from an altar than to be able to enter helpfully into the travail of a sin-sick soul because one has in his own life trodden with Christ the agonizing wine-press and has risen with Him into a new life; so, in spite of the protest of the Fourth Gospel, the push in the direction of the materialization of spiritual things which Christianity had received from competition with the Mystery Religions went steadily forward.

Such are the three glimpses of the Eucharist which we obtain from the New Testament. In the first our Lord institutes it as a memorial of His death. In the second, St. Paul rescues it from abuse, and seeks to preserve it as a memorial, and as a symbol of the unity of Christ's body and the sharing by every member of that body in Christ's Life. In the third we see a great inspired mystic seeking to rescue Christianity from materialization and degradation—a process not directly mentioned in the New Testament, but which we can still clearly discern by a study of the Fathers and the history of religions. The author of the Fourth Gospel sought to prevent Christianity from becoming a Mystery Religion, and to preserve it as a genuine spiritual mysticism.

The set toward materialism was, however, too strong. Catholic Christianity became practically a Mystery Religion. There

are not wanting those who would lead us back to that goal now. There is, however, nothing in the New Testament to warrant it. True we can detect through outside sources that that tendency was at work in the last part of the Apostolic Age, but the voice of no canonical New Testament writer can rightly be quoted in sanction of it, and the last great mystic, whose inspired pen interpreted better than any other the mind of Christ, set his face and the weight of his great spiritual authority squarely against it.

CHAPTER VII

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

The purpose of religion is to contribute to life. The aim of all religion is so to bring men into helpful communion with their spiritual environment as to help them to a fuller life. The life which a religion aims to produce is, therefore, the goal which it sets before itself. This goal may be two-fold, life in this world and life in a world to come, but, even so, the two are closely related; one will be regarded as dependent upon the other. The goal of the Christian religion is the kind of life that it deems possible, to which it invites, which it demands. Sin defaces and destroys life. Over against sin righteousness has sometimes been put as the goal of salvation. Life is, however, larger than righteousness, although a worthy life includes righteousness. Life is conscious, sensitive, social; life is communion with the Highest; life is love, effort, enjoyment, achievement, sacrifice, righteousness, character. When we seek to ascertain the New Testament ideal of the Christian life, then, we seek to discover to what, when a man is saved from sin, the writers of the New Testament thought he had been saved unto—unto what kind of life they believed the Father, revealed in Jesus Christ, had called them and all men.

I

In its conception of the ideal life as in other elements of religious thought New Testament Christianity took its starting point from Judaism. Judaism at the beginning of the Christian era was the result of a long historical process. At the beginning the Hebrews, like other Semites and early peoples, had sought

their God as an ally in the struggle for material existence. Health of body, a flourishing family, large flocks and herds, had been the aim of the individual. The subjugation of enemies, peace and prosperity, had been the ideal for the nation. By Elijah and the eighth century prophets they were taught that national prosperity was dependent upon individual morality, and that Yahweh, their God, would give them prosperity only if they were moral. The whole ideal, however, remained a national one. The individual must be ethical for the sake of the land, so that the nation might be blessed with prosperity. As this ideal continued it grew in the course of centuries into the Messianic ideal—an ideal which, in spite of the supernatural elements which entered into it, continued to hold before the minds of Hebrew devotees the thought that earthly power and the enjoyment of material abundance were the end and aim of life.[1] Jews who had abandoned the hope of the establishment of such a kingdom upon earth, frequently still hoped for its enjoyment in Heaven.

At the beginning of the Christian era another phase of Judaism was more prominent than Messianism; that was Pharisaism. In the minds of most of the Pharisees the Messianic hope, though perhaps entertained as a tenet, had fallen into the background. They were intent on observing the Law. That was the immediate duty and it absorbed all their thought. Whatever God might have for them in the future, it was clear that he now demanded that their life be regulated by the Law; they accordingly set themselves to keep the Law. The Law required, for example, that the Sabbath be kept holy, they therefore developed many rules the observance of which would insure the observance of this requirement of the Law. The Law laid upon the farmer, when he reaped his field, not to reap the corner, but to leave it for the poor; so elaborate regulations came into existence that one might know when he had properly fulfilled this requirement. In this way the oral law was in the time of our Lord growing up—a law which afterward became the Mishna and Talmud. While many who observed this law doubtless were careful of the inner life and sought mystic union

[1] See, for example, The Apocalypse of Baruch, chapter 29: 5, 6.

with God, its tendency as a whole was to fasten the thought on outward details and to make men feel satisfied with themselves, if they fulfilled such details. This had been the effect even before the oral law had fairly begun to develop, for we find in many of the post-Exilic Psalms the expression of a consciousness of righteousness such as they alone possess who have a definite outward standard by which to measure themselves (Ps. 36:10; 59:3; 18:20-24). Pharisaism was in the Apostolic Age the dominant element in Judaism.

Pharisees did not, however, constitute the whole nation. The Sadducees were rich, worldly, and in political affairs influential, but religiously they appear to have had no common ideal—no religious goal for which they were striving. The Essenes, like the Pharisees, were striving for righteousness—a righteousness of external purity and conformity to regulations—and they seem to have striven even more effectually than the Pharisees, for they withdrew from the world and lived in monasteries, but they were comparatively few and affected the life of the nation but little, so that on the whole the Jewish nation appeared as a people deeply religious, intent upon observing minute outward rules which they believed God had given, and whose conception of righteousness in large measure in consequence consisted of the belief that it had to do mainly with outward observances.

It would be unfair, however, to leave the impression that there were no other elements in Judaism. It was believed that in olden time God had himself appeared to Abraham, Moses, Gideon, and the mother of Samson; the record of these visitations formed part of their scriptures. Isaiah had seen Yahweh in his Temple, and Ezekiel had had his vision of Yahweh sitting on his throne riding on the thunder-cloud as his chariot (Eze. 1), and doubtless in every generation there were Hebrews who cherished the belief that the vision of God, which had been given to some great souls was the highest blessing vouchsafed to mortal man. The author of the fifty-first Psalm thought of communion with God's free Spirit as giving the highest joy, and he believed that such communion was dependent upon purity of heart (Ps. 51:10-12), and

others must have shared his view or his Psalm would not have been placed in the Psalter and used as a hymn. In later generations, even in the Talmudic period, it was believed that a vision like Ezekiel's—the Merkabah [1] (i. e., the Chariot) they called it—was sometimes seen by the purest souls. Holy men, while not claiming such experiences for themselves, believed that the Shekinah, God's visible presence, had manifested itself to ancient holy Rabbis. Always there was the belief that the outward life was not all; that a clean heart and communion with God were the highest treasures of the religious life, and yet few apparently believed such experiences possible for them, and the dominant influences in Jewish life were the ideals of the Pharisees. Life was regulated by rules; revelation had long since ceased, it was believed; no one thought of claiming a Merkabah vision for himself; it was believed that such visions might be experienced only by rare souls who faithfully kept all the regulations of the Law.

II

In striking contrast to the ideal life visioned by first century Judaism is the religious life portrayed by our Lord. Conscious of union with God and proclaiming to men the possibility of the enjoyment of a closer conscious sonship with God than they had yet experienced, he lived a life guided by inner spiritual energy, and taught that men might live in a similar way. In living this life he cast aside rules which hampered and hindered, however hoary such rules might be, or however sacred. He expressed his ideal of life by the term "The Kingdom of God." It was a term which, in the language of the day, meant the direct rule of God. It signified that man was to cease trying to guide himself and submit his life—his heart—to the direct control of God. But the term also had a social connotation. A kingdom involves social

[1] For a fuller statement, see Abelson's *Jewish Mysticism.*

relations. God was to rule each individual and ideal social relations between man and man were to be established. The righteousness to be established under God's direct control was to be genuine and vital—not mere conformity to outward regulations. "I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:20). Some of the ways in which Jesus' ideal of life differed from that of the majority of the Jews of his time are portrayed in the fifth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel. A righteous man should possess a heart free from all hatred—that root from which murder springs; he should never speak disparagingly of his brethren; he should never entertain a lustful thought; he should have but one standard of truthfulness; he should never act from a spirit of revenge; he should love his enemies; realizing that he is a child of God, he should be perfect as a child as God is perfect as a Father (Matt. 5:21-48). Such a life will be lived under God's direct rule; it will be pure of heart, and "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Empowered by the vision of God it will bring forth the fruits of righteousness, for "every good tree bringeth forth good fruit"; "by their fruits ye shall know them" (Matt. 7:16, 17). When the operation of the regulations of the Law hindered the full expression of this inner life in good deeds, the Law was set aside. Thus, when the Pharisees objected because Jesus healed on the Sabbath Day, he declared that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Mk. 2:27).

When our Lord invited his disciples to learn to live the highest life he said, "Follow me" (Matt. 4:19). Later he declared, "Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Mk. 3:35). He devoted his life to the accomplishment of the will of God; he called others to do the same, and they who heed the call become kindred to him in spirit. The kingdom or "rule" of God might be understood as submitting to God's will, but the ideal life is more than submission; it is active enlistment for the doing of God's will. God is like the shepherd who goes forth to seek the one lost sheep or like the woman who

sweeps the house for her one lost coin (Lu. 15:4-10). It is his will that the lost shall be found; that the perishing shall be saved; he suffers to accomplish this; he sends his Son to call forth reverence in the wicked husbandmen (Matt. 21:37). Those who seek to live as their Father lives will, then, seek out the lost and lonely—the human derelicts—and try to save them. They will be the Good Samaritans who, unmindful of their own convenience and their own prejudices, will lift the wounded and at the cost of labor and the expenditure of money give them healing care (Lu. 10:33 ff.). On the Judgment Day God will regard feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, visiting and ministering to prisoners as service rendered to himself (Matt. 25:34-40).

Such a life is a life of the highest heroism. "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake shall find it" (Matt. 16:24, 25). "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved" (Mk. 13:13). A life of self-forgetfulness, in which one abandons all, risking even life itself to accomplish the will of God—a life that is so pure through and through that it enjoys the vision of God, obtains its joy from that vision, and forgets even its own salvation in doing God's will—that is the Christian life as our Master portrayed it and called us to it.

III

As one passes from the teaching of Jesus to the Acts of the Apostles he experiences a great change of religious atmosphere. Remarkable as is the life depicted in the early chapters of that book, its narrative reveals with vivid clearness that the Apostles had not yet grasped the ideal which Jesus had endeavored to set before them. After the Day of Pentecost they were keenly con-

scious of God's presence with them. This gave them courage to proclaim that Jesus, whose crucifixion the hierarchy had procured, was the Messiah, and to withstand the hierarchy when called to account for it. A new spirit of brotherhood and of unselfishness also filled them. "Not one of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own" (Acts 4:32); they pooled their property and began to live a community-life. These were acts indicative of the new religious life that their faith in Christ had produced: the springs of their courage were renewed, and a new generosity was created within them.[1] Further than this they did nothing but sit down to wait for their Master's return. Their conception of the Messianic kingdom was still that of the Jewish apocalypses: the Messiah, their Master, had been caught up to heaven that he might return on the clouds to overthrow Rome and make Jerusalem the mistress of the world. So far from thinking that they had to go out and by courageous lives win men to the lofty and heroic type of life their Master had taught, they supposed that they only had to wait, and that not long, until the returning Messiah would accomplish all for them. Under the circumstances we should not blame them. Who would have done better with their knowledge and outlook? But the fact remains that in contrast with the ideal of life that Christ had taught, the first disciples settled down to foster an ideal that was, in spite of the personal sacrifices which it involved, sluggish, unheroic, and in the broad sense, selfish. Instead of going out to serve others as their Master had done, they were expecting him to come back and destroy others. It took the rude hand of the persecutor to eject them from the comfortable nest in Jerusalem which they made for themselves and to set them, without realizing what they were really doing, upon the great and heroic task of conquering the world.

[1] While this communistic experiment did great credit to the spirit of the early Christians, it was economically unsound. It was, apparently, practiced but a few years, during which they ate up all their resources. Whenever we hear of them afterward during that century they are "the *poor* saints" who are in Jerusalem, to whom others send alms. Doubtless one thing that helped them to try the communistic experiment was the expectation of the early return of the Lord. Communism can never be a success until both selfishness and laziness are eradicated from human nature, and then it will not be needed.

Even the community-life which they had established in Jerusalem did not long maintain an ideal character. Some, like Ananias and Sapphira, sought to gain the reputation for unselfishness while retaining the benefits of selfishness, but there are good and bad, better and best in every community, and no body of men has ever risen as one man to the level of a lofty ideal. The new spirit of brotherhood, too, proved unable to transcend the bounds of linguistic and cultural differences. At first the administration of the common funds had been left in the hands of the Apostles. Bred in Palestine, the Apostles spoke Aramaic, and, like us all, found it easier to sympathize with those brought up in their own land, whose speech they could understand, and whose ways were their ways. If this were not so, it was, at least, believed to be so, for "there arose a murmuring of the Grecian Jews against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration" (Acts 6: 1). The event proved, however, that the Apostles had more of the spirit of Christ than their critics gave them credit for having, for they proposed that the distribution to the common necessities be committed to a new class of officers, to be called Deacons, and, when their critics elected to the diaconate only Greek-speaking Jews, the Apostles turned the whole business over to them without a murmur.

In spite of the noble spirit thus manifested, and notwithstanding that the Apostles were driven out of Jerusalem in spite of themselves, their ideal of the Christian life remained that of a material kingdom, to be established in a cataclysm by the miraculously returning Christ. Throughout the first century, so far as we know, those Christians who outgrew this expectation were very few indeed. The writers of the Gospels wove it into them; echoes of it are found in many Epistles; while in the Book of Revelation it finds its impressive but terrible presentation. In many respects this ideal is the opposite of the ideal of the Christian life gleaned from the teaching of Jesus which we have set forth above: it fostered the spirit of revenge and it fastened the thought on material reward rather than on doing the will of God. We are accordingly presented with this paradox in Apostolic his-

tory: the majority of the Apostles lived the heroic life, while entertaining an unheroic ideal of life. Circumstances compelled them to live in some degree as their Master had lived in spite of their inherited ideal.

IV

The reasoning which made St. Paul first a persecutor and then, in consequence of a new experience, a Christian, has been outlined in a previous chapter. We have also in chapter IV traced something of the working of his conscience—that inner nature that is deeper than mere logic—through all this. It is necessary, however, to recall something of this in order to understand his experience and the view of the Christian life which in consequence he held.

As a Jew Saul of Tarsus had conscientiously tried to keep the Law, but he found himself unable to keep the command, "Thou shalt not covet." He struggled hard to observe it, but his failure to do so was so regular and so constant that in describing it afterward he could say, "I find then the law, that, to me who would do good, evil is present. For I delight in the Law of God after the inward man: but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity under the law of sin which is in my members" (Rom. 7:21-23). So oft had he tried and so often failed that he almost despaired. "O wretched I," he exclaimed, "who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?" (Rom. 7:24). This was his experience as a Jew. When he had experienced his vision near Damascus and had yielded himself to Jesus Christ, he found life different. No real conversion is a mere matter of logic. One must, of course, have a logical explanation for his experience in order to co-ordinate his intellectual and emotional life and devote himself as a united personality to the service of a new Master, but in genuine conversion the springs of the will are touched, the whole moral life

is quickened by the reception of new power. That which was before impossible now becomes possible; the hitherto unattainable is now attainable. Many mystics in many countries and many religions have felt that they came into such mystic union with God, that they experienced such a change. Their experiences were akin to St. Paul's; the quality of their conversion was determined by the moral goal for which they were striving, and which they accordingly felt empowered by the mystic vision to attain.

St. Paul from childhood had believed in God and had tried to serve him. When he tried to keep the Law he had doubtless prayed for strength, but, when he accepted Jesus as the Messiah and yielded himself to the leadership of Jesus, God became so consciously near to him—he felt himself so united with God—that his being was flooded with new power. The covetous thoughts which he had been unable hitherto to exclude from his mind were now banished. He seemed to himself to have tapped the Source of infinite spiritual power. A new uniform course of action was established in his inner life; it became so steady and regular as to become a law. "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the Law of sin and death" (Rom. 8:2). At the first, as has been pointed out in an earlier chapter, St. Paul's theology had changed very little; he had simply accepted Jesus as the expected Jewish Messiah, but the experience of God into which Jesus led him created within him a moral revolution; it gave him uniform victory, where he had before experienced uniform moral defeat.

To the end of his days the contrast between St. Paul's old life of moral failure and his new life of inner satisfaction because of victory seemed to him to be analogous to the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. "We were buried with him through Baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united to him by the likeness of his death, we shall be also by the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away, that we should no longer be in

bondage to sin" (Rom. 6:4-6). St. Paul here sets forth the secret of his moral victory and inner peace. In his Epistle to the Galatians (ch. 2:20) he puts it in another way: "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself up for me." Here we find the same pæan of moral victory: the past is dead, or he is dead to it. He has been crucified to it with Christ; he lives joyously; he can control his desires and do the good which he purposes; but the power to do so comes so clearly from Christ that it seems to be not St. Paul who is living, but Christ who has taken possession of him and is living in him.

This brings us to consider another phase of St. Paul's thought. His mysticism is a Christ-mysticism. The source of his morally triumphant life is God—"Thanks be unto God who always leadeth us in triumph in Christ" (2 Cor. 2:14)—yet it is Christ with whom he is united, Christ in whom he lives, Christ who lives in him. The union was so complete that what he did Christ did—"for me to live is Christ" (Phil. 1:21)—his triumphs were Christ's triumphs. St. Paul did not regard this as an experience peculiarly his own; it was not only possible for every Christian, it was, he believed, the normal life of every Christian. This appears from the following passages: "As many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ" (Gal. 3:27); "My little children, of whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you" (Gal. 4:19); "For ye died that your life might be hid with Christ in God" (Col. 3:3); "There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Rom.; 8:1); "In whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit" (Eph. 2:22); "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith, to the end that ye being rooted and grounded in love, may be strong to apprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God" (Eph. 3:17-19); "God was pleased to make known the riches of his glory among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you the hope of glory" (Col. 1:27).

Such utterances leave no room for doubt that St. Paul believed that every real believer was joined to Christ in a vital union. With that variety of expression in which his thought is invariably clothed he voiced his conviction under different figures and in a number of ways. At times Christ is in the believer, and at times the believer is in Christ; at times the believer lives by faith, and at other times he does not live at all, but only Christ lives in him.

The result of this union is that the Christian is no longer fleshly, but spiritual; he leads no longer a natural, but a spiritual life. This is the meaning of such passages as the following: "For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the spirit the things of the spirit. For the mind of the flesh is death; but the mind of the spirit is life and peace. . . . . But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you" (Rom. 8:6, 7, 9); "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control; against such there is no law. And they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the passions and lusts thereof" (Gal. 5:22-24); "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works" (Eph. 2:10); "For the fruit of the light is in all goodness and righteousness and truth" (Eph. 5:9); "It is God who worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13); "We all with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord are transformed into the same image from glory to glory" (2 Cor. 3:18).

As has been pointed out in a previous chapter, St. Paul believed that this life of union with Christ, which bore this ethical fruit, made the Christian free from external rules. His nature, being now spiritual and indwelt by the Divine Christ, could properly become its own law; it needed no other; it was free from all other. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. 3:17).[1] It was for this reason that in discussing social impurity

[1] It follows that St. Paul distinctly repudiates ascetic practices. He declares that such "things have a show of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and severity to the body; but are not of any value against the indulgence of the flesh" (Col. 2:23).

St. Paul could say, "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient" (1 Cor. 6:12). He fled from fornication, not because it violated a Decalogue, but because it was contrary to the laws of the spiritual life—it is spiritual suicide. "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit" with him (1 Cor. 6:17). It is a high ideal and one that might be actual, if only we were, like St. Paul, really united to Christ. As it is, most Christians still need rules!

In St. Paul's conception, the Christian is not united with Christ simply that he may be ethical—bring forth the fruits of the Spirit (though he must do that)—but that he may become a sharer of Christ's work and Christ's sufferings. Near the close of his career he had still before him this ideal: "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings" (Phil. 3:10); "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and fill up on my part that which is lacking of the affliction of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the Church" (Col. 1:24). Here is no morbid desire to suffer for the sake of suffering, no ascetic ideal to suffer simply for the mortification of the flesh; it is rather such absorption in the task of making Christ known to men that he has forgotten self, has left comfort and ease behind, and is ready to endure anything, if only Christ may be made known to men so that they too may live in him. The impulse which arose from mystic union with Christ, first gave power to realize his ideals; secondly as a consequence it brought forth the fruits of the Spirit in an ethical life; and lastly it sent him forth in self-forgetful suffering to take up Christ's unfinished task. "I am a debtor," he exclaims, "both to Greeks and to Barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish" (Rom. 1:14); "Necessity is laid upon me; for woe is me, if I preach not the Gospel" (1 Cor. 9:16). By St. Paul the Master's ideal of a clean life, lived by inner principles—by inner power—and dedicated to heroic ends, was welcomed. To it he dedicated himself; he made it his own.

In the minds of many good people there is an instinctive prejudice against those who claim to have attained in religion

anything approaching that which St. Paul believed he had experienced. In so many cases the devotee loses his poise, fails to maintain his humility, becomes conceited, and impossible, that it is well perhaps to be critical to a degree. But before one reaches an unfavorable judgment with regard to St. Paul he should note and ponder two remarkable facts.

1. Although St. Paul lived in an age that regarded abnormal emotional experiences and nervous manifestations as evidences of extraordinary spirituality, and although he himself possessed the ability to experience ecstacies and had done so more than once (1 Cor. 14: 18 & 2 Cor. 12: 1-4), yet he was so sane in his judgment of spiritual reality that, when men all about him were attaching supreme importance to ecstatic experience, he regarded it as of relatively little importance and discouraged its manifestation (1 Cor. 14: 18, 19, 27, 28). This is all the more remarkable, when one remembers that St. Paul did not know as we do that there is in ecstacy a very large physical element and that it is more a matter of nerves than of spiritual endowment. That in such an age and environment he should have had such an accurate appreciation of values, goes far to disarm that suspicion which in some other cases may, perhaps, be justified.

2. Although conscious that he was so united to Christ that just by living out the life Christ had begotten within him he could not only live an outwardly moral life, but conquer even the lustful and hateful thoughts within him, he never became a perfectionist; he never lost his Christian modesty. True, he once wrote: "Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded" (Phil. 3: 15), but when the words are interpreted by the context, it is clear that they mean, "Let us, who, by our union with Christ, possess all the elements of a complete life, be thus minded." In the same context, writing toward the close of his life from a Roman prison, he humbly said: "Not that I have already obtained, or am made perfect: but I press on, if so be that I may lay hold of that for which also I was laid hold of by Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself yet to have laid hold: but this one thing I do, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching

forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." Here is the ideal Christian attitude. He is happy in Christ; through him he has for many years found ability to keep even his inner life clean; but he is still conscious that there is much to attain; the finite child yet falls short of the ideals of the infinite Father; the goal at which he aims is a flying goal, and yet he nerves himself with joy and peace to strive to attain it, because every step is taken and every effort made in the inspiring fellowship of such a Master.[1]

V

Of the remaining New Testament Epistles two reflect from different points of view conceptions of the Christian life kindred to St. Paul's. The First Epistle of St. Peter, as was pointed out in a previous chapter, seems to present much the same conception of the death of Christ as that held by St. Paul. Christians are begotten "again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" (1 Pet. 1:3; cf. Rom. 1:4); he took our sins in his own body up to the tree, "That we, having died unto sins might live unto righteousness" (1 Pet. 2:24). These sentences put tersely the same theory of salvation that is more elaborately set forth by St. Paul. For the subject now under consideration it is important to notice that St. Peter, like St. Paul, regarded the genuine Christian life as beginning in mystically living over in one's experience the death and resurrection of Christ. Just as

[1] Those who accuse St. Paul of being egotistical and not modest base their opinions upon his Epistle to the Galatians and upon such passages as 2 Corinthians 10-13—passages written at times, when he had been accused and felt obliged to defend himself. What one writes under such circumstances does not reveal his truest, calmest self. When St. Paul wrote he had no idea that we should be centuries after reading his defenses, or indeed any of his Epistles. Certainly those who misjudge him on this ground would feel unjustly treated themselves to be called egotistical and lacking in modesty because of documents written under such circumstances. Such egotism as St. Paul had was that which belongs to every positive and efficient character.

Christ died, the Christian must die to sin; just as he was raised from the dead, the Christian must be raised to a new life.

The ethics of the Christian life as set forth by St. Peter are the same as in St. Paul. Many of the phrases by which the duties of different classes of people are set forth are so nearly identical with expressions in the Epistle to the Ephesians that they have raised the question as to whether there is not a dependence of one of these Epistles upon the other. The Epistle of St. Peter is, however, so brief that it does not set forth as St. Paul does the author's conception of how the inner springs of experience produce the ethical life. It seems probable, however, that on this point, too, the author would have agreed with St. Paul.

One thing is, however, clear. St. Peter, like St. Paul, had caught the Master's ideal of a heroic Christian life, and to it he summons his readers in no uncertain accents. The Epistle was written when Christians were persecuted for being Christians (1 Pet. 4: 14); perhaps it was the first time that Christians had suffered specifically for this cause. They are to endure it manfully, following the example of their Master. "Because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, that ye should follow in his steps" (1 Pet. 2: 21); "Forasmuch then as Christ suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves also with the same mind" (1 Pet. 4: 1); "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial among you, which cometh upon you to prove you, as though a strange thing happened unto you: but insomuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings, rejoice; that at the revelation of his glory also ye may rejoice with exceeding joy" (1 Pet. 4: 12, 13). St. Peter had at the beginning looked forward to the ease and plenty of the speedily approaching Messianic kingdom, but the Spirit of Christ, combined with the hard school of stern events, had now enabled him to catch fully the spirit of his Master, and he knew that the call of Christ was a call to heroic service and endurance.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, though his main interest was the explanation of the sacrificial work of Christ, shared in many respects St. Paul's view of the Christian life.

Like St. Paul he made much of faith and, in order to stimulate it cited eloquently many instances of what had in former days been accomplished by faith (Heb. 11). Like St. Paul, too, he seems to have regarded the Cross as imposing a curse upon our Lord, for, after speaking of how certain parts of the sacrifices were regarded as unclean and were burned without the camp, he says: "Let us therefore go forth unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach" (Heb. 13:15). However this may be, after citing the victories won in different ages by those who had possessed extraordinary faith, he exhorts Christians (Heb. 12:1 ff.) to run with patience the race set before them, "looking unto Jesus, the author and perfector of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God. For consider him that hath endured such gainsaying of sinners against himself, that ye wax not weary, fainting in your souls." These words imply that the disciple is to live heroically as did the Master.

The author of this Epistle also enforces the lesson taught by Christ and emphasized by St. Paul, that the source of conduct is in the heart, and that from that source purity or impurity proceed. He exhorts his readers to beware "lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby many be defiled" (Heb. 12:15). The words are but a passing touch, but they reveal an appreciation of all the dire havoc that may be wrought by hate, when translated into deeds.

VI

Two other writers are found among the authors of New Testament Epistles whose conceptions of the sources of Christian life and the secret of its power differ widely from St. Paul's. They are the author of the Epistle of St. James and the author of the Pastoral Epistles. We shall examine the last mentioned first.

Doubtless it will come as a shock to some that the Pastoral Epistles are not St. Paul's,[1] but to the writer the marvel is that anyone, who understands at all the thought of the great Apostle and also that of the Pastoral Epistles, should not see that the two are not only antithetical but mutually exclusive. To the argument from difference of vocabulary and style one must add (1) the cold, curt tone of these Epistles[2] which were supposedly written to two of the Apostle's most loved and trusted companions—a tone so different from that with which St. Paul addressed others who were far less intimately associated with him—and (2) a difference in the conception of faith and the means of salvation such that the two conceptions could not exist in the same mind.[3]

To St. Paul faith was the response of the soul to the love of God manifested in Christ; it was instinctive and unpremeditated. It was a sort of glorified love. It resulted in such union with Christ that the believer became identified with his Master; what the believer did Christ did. To the writer of the Pastoral Epistles faith is a form of sound words or an outward statement; it is something that one can "keep" (2 Tim. 4:7), from which one can "depart" (1 Tim. 4:1) or "deny" (1 Tim. 5:8) or from which one can "err" (1 Tim. 6:10). This "faith" has become a "deposit" in the sense in which that term was used afterward by the Latin Fathers Irenæus and Tertullian; one believes it because he knows from whom he has received it, and therefore that he is receiving the genuine "deposit" and not a counterfeit (1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 2:2; 3:14 & Tit. 1:9). All this represents an atmosphere far removed from St. Paul. St. Paul regarded himself as an original witness; these Epistles represent a time when the Apostles had passed away and one must depend on

[1] At that period pseudepigraphic writing (i. e., attributing one's work to some prominent person who had passed away) was regarded by both Jews and Christians as a legitimate form of literature. It did not involve on their part moral terpitude any more than the historical novel does in our own time. Such work cannot therefore be counted a "forgery."

[2] The argument from the tone of these Epistles was admirably handled by the late E. Y. Hincks in the *Journal of Biblical Literature for* 1897, pp. 94-117 f.

[3] There are a few notes of St. Paul's woven into these Letters, e. g., 2 Timothy 4:9-18, but these have been greatly expanded by a writer who lived near the close of the first century.

tradition—a tradition received through known and authenticated channels. A part of the passages just cited were written to justify this point of view. The author is particularly unfortunate in representing St. Paul as saying, "I have kept the faith." St. Paul did not have to keep his faith; his faith kept him. It was not strange, however, for one writing some decades after St. Paul's death so to write; he and most of his contemporaries regarded the faith as a form of sound words (1 Tim. 6:3 & Tit. 2:1) in which one could be "nourished" (1 Tim. 4:6).

Another point in which the writer differs radically from St. Paul is in the place which he gives to works as a means of salvation. To St. Paul good works were the "fruits of the Spirit"; a Christian brought them forth as inevitably as a good tree brings forth good fruit. To the writer of these Epistles, however, works are something that are put on from the outside; at least, if they are produced by faith the writer nowhere says so. On the other hand we find such expressions as "that they who have believed God may be careful to maintain good works" (Tit. 3:8); "let every one who nameth the name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness" (2 Tim. 2:19). Perhaps the most curious statement in all the New Testament concerning salvation is this writer's statement that women "shall be saved through child-bearing, if they continue in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety" (1 Tim. 2:15). The statement is doubtless based on Genesis 3:16. The author was at this point quoting the story of the Fall in order to prove the subordinate place which in his judgment women should occupy. Nevertheless such a statement, even as a matter of exegesis, betrays a very un-Pauline conception of the nature of salvation. Faith may have been employed by the author of these Epistles in two senses: but it appears even in such passages as 1 Timothy 1:19 and 3:9 to be the general body of belief which one must accept rather than the outgoing of the soul in surrender to God and to Christ. An exception is probably to be found in 1 Timothy 2:15 quoted just above. Here faith is coupled with love, and so is an attitude of the inner life; but even here it is made an adjunct to child-bearing as a means of salvation. We are com-

pelled to conclude then that, if the author did not believe in salvation by works, he at all events gives to works a very different place in his conception of salvation from St. Paul's.

Another point of difference from St. Paul is the prominence of the Episcopate in these Epistles. For the closing years of the first century we have slight information as to the development of Church government; apart from these Epistles, practically nothing. Into that vexed question we need not go here further than to observe the light that the qualifications and conduct demanded of bishops throws upon the general level of Christian life. From these it is evident that purity, sobriety, and devotion were looked for in all.

The early Christians had been collected from all sorts and conditions of men and the Church officers, of whom Timothy was supposed to be one, had sometimes to discipline them. Some interesting information as to Christian faults and Church discipline may be gathered from the following passage: "Against an elder (presbyter) receive not an accusation, except at the mouth of two or three witnesses. Them that sin reprove in the sight of all, that the rest also may be in fear. I charge thee in the sight of God and Christ Jesus, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without prejudice, doing nothing by partiality. Lay hands hastily on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins: keep thyself pure" (1 Tim. 5:19-22). Timothy is here addressed as though he were a bishop. It is accordingly evident that in the community where the author of these Epistles lived it was customary for bishops to sit and hear complaints against members of the congregation, sometimes even against presbyters, and that the bishop also inflicted punishment. This was doubtless done to keep Christian differences from heathen tribunals (1 Cor. 6:1 ff.). Timothy is warned not to be partial in his judgments or hasty in his punishments, but to keep himself pure. The "laying on of hands" contemplated in this passage, as the whole context makes evident, is not for the purpose of ordaining, but of punishing. If the bishop "lay hands hastily" upon a man, he may punish the innocent or, from anger, punish excessively. If he does not pun-

ish for correction, he encourages wrong-doing and becomes "a partaker of other men's sins." Ordination is here never mentioned.[1] The only subject of the passage is the punishment of wrong.

The Pastoral Epistles afford us a glimpse of Christian life in the period after the first glow of the Apostolic age had passed, when the Apostles were dead, when there was no great inspiring leader, and when the Church had begun to devise rules that the great treasure of the Gospel might not be dissipated by esoteric speculations.

The author of the Epistle of James misunderstood St. Paul's doctrine of salvation by faith and frankly opposed it (Jas. 2: 14-28). He enters into a long argument to prove that "faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself." "Show me thy faith apart from thy works," he exclaims, "and I will show thee my faith by my works." Even Abraham he contends was not justified by his faith, but by his obedience, and obedience was "works." He reaches the conclusion that "by works a man is justified, and not only by faith." His conception of faith, too, is that it is assent to a fact or statement (cf. Jas. 2: 19) rather than the out-going of one's whole inner life as St. Paul regarded it. All would, of course, agree that such assent to facts apart from an ethical life accomplishes nothing in the way of salvation. On the contrary, it may make one's guilt for disobedience all the greater.

Since this writer's conception of faith was such, it is no surprise that he regarded the Gospel as a new Law—the perfect Law of liberty (Jas. 1: 25). This Law one must obey; he must be "a doer that worketh" in order to be "blessed in his doing." There is here no mysticism like St. Paul's. The writer teaches a sort of ethical culture under the leadership of Jesus Christ. While the Gospel is a new Law, this writer did not, like St. Paul, regard the ethical parts of the Mosaic Law as abrogated for a Christian (see Jas. 2: 9-13). His conception of a Christian life is

[1] In *The Book of Common Prayer,* pp. 40 and 526, this passage is apparently made to refer to ordination. That is not the only instance in the history of religion in which a sound principle is upheld by the misapplication of an ancient text.

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

noble, but not heroic. One is to control his tongue, he is to be meek, bitterness of heart is to be banished along with jealousies and factions. Christians are to live peaceably and purely. Those who have sinned are to humble themselves before God. Men are not to judge one another harshly; they are to realize that all their doings are really dependent upon divine Providence. Riches are regarded as a sin, especially if acquired by grinding the face of the laborer, and the author speaks as though all wealth were so gained. Our Lord's command not to swear—not to have the double standard of honor that the taking of an oath implies—is earnestly repeated (Jas. 5:12), and frequent devotion, confession of sins, and prayer is enjoined. An especial blessing is pronounced on those who win the erring ones from the error of their ways.

Of great interest is the author's definition of religion (*θρησκεία*—devotion or worship). "Pure and undefiled *threskeia*," or religious service, the author declares, "is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world" (Jas. 1:27). In the ancient world orphans and widows were the prey of every sharper. They were the most helpless and pitiable members of every community. The writer's conception of pure and undefiled worship of God is then innocency and helpfulness to the most helpless. The author does not, like Horace Bushnell, think of "the expulsive power of a great affection" to produce innocency and purity. One has "to keep himself unspotted from the world." Nevertheless his conception of the Christian life is one in which many find comfort. Not all have the mystic gift; not all feel the exultation of a great emotion. Perhaps in the Christian life the followers of St. James have been as numerous, if not as prominent, as those of St. Paul.

The authors of the Epistles of St. Jude and 2 Peter, while each has his own individuality, represent in general the same type of thought with reference to the Christian life as do the Pastorals and St. James. St. Jude is later than the Pastorals which he quotes (vs. 17), and 2 Peter is later than St. Jude and dependent upon it. These two writings take us into the second century. Each opposes a heresy, and St. Jude is so occupied with his denunciation of those

who adhere to it that he has little to say of the Christian life. The author of 2 Peter, who is equally strenuous in opposing the heresy, is also concerned to strengthen the faith of those who are assailed by doubts of the Gospel because the promised second coming of the Lord had not occurred. Nevertheless in his beautiful "addition table" (2 Pet. 1:5-8) he describes admirably the goal at which a Christian should aim if he would lead the ideal inner life: "In your faith supply virtue; and in your virtue knowledge; and in your knowledge self-control; and in your self-control patience; and in your patience godliness; and in your godliness love of the brethren (φιλαδελφία); and in your love of the brethren love (αγάπη). For if these things are yours and abound, they make you to be not idle nor unfruitful unto the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ."

VII

It has been pointed out in preceding chapters from different points of view what a unique place the author of the Fourth Gospel holds in the history of the thought of the Apostolic Age. Living at the end of the first century, when Christianity had been separated from Judaism and Judaism had become hostile, when eclectic mixtures of elements borrowed from heathen systems were threatening to submerge the unique elements of Christianity, he was able to re-interpret Christ and the Christian message so as to commend it to the thoughtful minds of the time. But for this re-interpretation, it is doubtful whether Christianity would have survived. The author was able to render this service because of the reality of his Christian life. He was not only an able thinker, but he had undergone a profound mystical religious experience, an experience as genuine as that of St. Paul, whom this writer greatly admired, and as truly mystical.[1] Whether he had as a boy,

[1] Not the least of the services rendered to Christianity by Canon Streeter is his demonstration of this point: *The Four Gospels,* ch. XIII.

as some suppose, seen Christ in Jerusalem, it was not of that of which he was speaking, when he wrote: "That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld and our hands have handled of the word of life . . . .—that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us: yea and our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ," but of his mystic experience. The characteristic of great mystic experience wherever one finds it is the certainty which it gives him who passes through it. He seems to see, to handle, and he could be no more certain if with eyes and hands he had actually seen and handled physical objects. This author does not, like St. Paul, tell in any detail of his visions, but whether in ecstacy or not, he had, like St. Paul, felt that Christ had so honored him with his fellowship and had so introduced him into fellowship or community of life with God that he had been re-born. In that community of life he lived. His experience of it made him certain of the kind of being Christ was. Through his spirit pulsed the life that was from the beginning; he possessed the secret of life for which the ages had yearned; he lived, because of his fellowship with Jesus Christ, in a community of life with God.

It was this experience which gave him courage, and which he felt gave him authority, to re-interpret Christianity. He felt that he understood the mind of Christ as his predecessors had not. Christ had, he believed, promised that his Spirit should come and lead into all the truth (Jno. 16: 13); the author of the Fourth Gospel felt that he had that Spirit as a leader; in following Him he could say to the world some of those things which, while Christ was in the body, his disciples could not bear to hear (Jno. 16: 12). The ability to speak with such authority is the result of great first-hand mystic experience. This experience transfigured this writer's conception of the Christian life.

According to this Gospel the Christian life begins in a new birth (Jno. 3: 5). It is not only a birth from above (ἄνωθεν), but it was a virgin birth, for "as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe

on his name, who (οἱ, not ὅς[1]) were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (Jno. 1:12, 13). The author of these words had heard of the Virgin Birth of Jesus, but to him the One "by whom all things were made," including men's bodies, did not need to have the Holy Spirit intervene to make a special body for Him.[2] The Logos "became flesh" (Jno. 1:14) of his own volition and act, just as he lay down his life and took it again by his own will and purpose (Jno. 10:18). This writer accordingly takes occasion to say that the real virgin birth is a spiritual experience which every genuine Christian shares, and those who experience it have Christ's authority to become children of God.

One who held such an exalted opinion of the beginning of the Christian life could not think it transitory, so the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John insist again and again that this life is eternal. As was pointed out in the last chapter many people of that time were seeking through the mystery religions for personal immortality; the author of the Gospel of John invites men to obtain this immortality, not in taurobolia and mystic orgies, but in actually sharing through the mediation of Christ the life of God. God is eternal; he who through this mystic birth comes to share in his spirit the life of God will, of course, live forever. He alone finds the secret for which the elaborate mystic religions were eloquent evidence that men were groping.

No writer in the New Testament insists, however, more strongly than this author that the Christian life is an ethical life. He does not, like St. Paul, discard the ethical portions of the Pentateuch, but apparently assumes that they are the commands of God. "This is the love of God that we keep his commandments"

[1] It is well known that a number of ancient manuscripts have ὅς here instead of οἱ. The best modern editors have, however, seen that this was a dogmatic change made in the interest of a doctrine. In reality it spoils the grammar of the sentence.

[2] This is further proved by the fact that he twice represents people as saying that Jesus was the son of Joseph (Jno. 1:45; 6:42), and does not, as in other cases where he thinks misunderstanding might be produced, insert any corrective statement. For such corrective statements, see John 2:24, 25; 7:39; 10:18; 12:33; 17:3.

(1 Jno. 5:3); "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him" (1 Jno. 2:4); "Whoso hath the world's goods, and beholdeth his brother in need, and shutteth up his compassion from him, how doth the love of God abide in him?" (1 Jno. 3:17); "He that saith he abideth in him, ought himself to walk, even as he walked" (1 Jno. 2:6); "Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not; whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him" (1 Jno. 3:6). This author does not employ St. Paul's figures, but it is clear that he teaches the same great truth—a truth that Jesus had taught before either of them—that the life of God in the soul of man must produce the fruit of ethical living. No one can know so much of God that he is emancipated from the necessity of personal purity, self-control, common honesty, and the duties of common kindliness and humanity. Indeed, he goes further and makes the life of Christ—that life of self-sacrifice—the Christian's example. The Christian ought "to walk even as he walked." He further tells us that Christ said: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you" (Jno. 13:34); "This is my commandment that ye love one another as I have loved you" (Jno. 15:12). It is too often overlooked that here is the real Christian commandment. When our Lord was asked what were the greatest commands in the Jewish Law, he said: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart" and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." This reply has been greatly praised, and with justice; but after all this was the best in Judaism. To love as Christ loved is to surpass Judaism, for he loved men better than he loved himself; he so loved that he gave himself. This, according to the author of the Fourth Gospel, is the pattern to which every Christian life should conform.

In his Epistle the author frequently returns to the thought that he who is a Christian does not normally commit sin. "Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him" (1 Jno. 3:6). The last part of this statement sounds harsh, but the writer's theology was not as harsh in reality as this sounds; he is given to making strong, posi-

tive statements which provoke attention. In another passage he treats the case of sin thus: "If any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world" (1 Jno. 2: 1, 2). The thought of this great Christian is that sin is not the product of the Christian life, but, among Christians, it is the product of the failure to live it. "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with him and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 Jno. 1: 5-7). "God is love and he that abideth in love abideth in God and God in him" (1 Jno. 4: 16). "The world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever" (1 Jno. 2: 17). One comes into fellowship with God through fellowship with his Son; those who are in fellowship with God do the will of God; those who do the will of God abide forever; they have that eternal life for which the nations of the Roman empire were seeking. Such is this author's teaching.

One does not need to say, after noting the teaching just discussed, that the author of the Fourth Gospel believed in the worthfulness and desirability of life. There is in his writing no trace of the thought so prevalent in India that conscious existence is a curse and that salvation is deliverance from it. Asceticism is equally far from this writer's thought. He tells us that Jesus said: "I came that they may have life and may have it abundantly" (Jno. 10: 10), and that he in his last great supplication said: "I pray not that thou shouldst take them from the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil. They are not of the world even as I am not of the world" (Jno. 17: 15, 16). A life of union with Christ so differentiates a Christian from the world that he may be in it, but not of it.

Christians are not only to be "in the world," but they are sent there by Christ to do his work. He reports that Jesus, in addressing the Father, said: "As thou didst send me into the

world, even so sent I them into the world" (Jno. 17:18). This writer had told of how the true light had shone into the world in Christ, how "he was manifested to take away our sins." It is that work that he believed Christ has sent his followers to continue. Christians receive an "anointing" (χρῖσμα), a bit of the nature of Christ (χρίστος), that nature gives added intelligence, teaching, guidance (1 Jno. 2:20 & 27). One whose nature was thus transformed could, he believed, go forth to be in his measure a christ as the Master had been the Christ.

In the teaching of the Fourth Gospel there is portrayed a transcendant Christian life, far richer in experience, far higher in its aims, far ampler in its achievement than most Christians have dreamed. It is so far in advance of that life which we live, that we are not only unwilling to believe that it is demanded of us, but, if we suspect any one is approaching it, we become suspicious of him. The author of this Gospel lived it or he could not have portrayed it. St. Paul, too, both lived it and portrayed it. Its fullest manifestation was in the Son of God, our Saviour, the Man of Nazareth. Of all the New Testament writers, St. Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel caught best the Master's ideal, and, each in his own way, set it forth. It is for this reason that their writings have been most influential, next to the teaching of Christ himself.

One who lives selfishly, trying to hold on to the world and be just Christian enough to escape punishment, is unworthy the name of Christian. He has never caught the vision of the Christ. No more has the man who thinks always in the terms of his own salvation. To live the life of fellowship with God—fellowship in experience, in purity, in love, in aims, in work, in suffering, and to thus be able to share in Christ's achievement—that is life indeed! To that life Christ called men. That call St. Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel echoed and interpreted. Life is Christian just in proportion as it approaches this standard.

INDEX OF AUTHORS

	PAGE
Abelson, J.	119
Angus, S.	107
Bacon, B. W.	22
Binet-Sanglé, C.	20
Blass, F.	104
Boissacq, E.	91, 99
Bruce, A. B.	61
Bundy, W. E.	20
Burkitt, F. C.	21
Caird, J.	61
Case, S. J.	17, 21
Davenport, F. M.	47
Deissmann, A.	91, 94
Dobschüts, E. von	22
Everett, C. C.	86
Foakes-Jackson, F. J.	21, 46
Fox, George	114
Gardner, P.	107
Gordon, G. A.	61
Gray, G. B.	91
Hastings, J.	108
Hepding, H.	107
Hincks, E. Y.	133
Homer	91, 99
Hort, F. J. A.	104
Ignatius	112
Jones, R. M.	19
Josephus, Flavius	91
Justin, Martyr	108
Kaplan, J. H.	5
Keep, R. P.	99
King, H. C.	24
Klausner, J.	24
Lake, K.	21, 46
Leuba, J. H.	19
McGiffert, A. C.	44
Moffatt, James	92
Monks, G. G.	104
Montefiore, C. G.	46
Moore, G. F.	18, 36, 45, 64, 65, 66, 72
Newton, C. T.	107
Osborne, H. F.	18
Preisigke, F.	99
Rivoira, G. T.	16
Sauppe, H.	107
Schmidt, N.	17
Schürer, E.	49
Schweitzer, A.	22
Scott, E. F.	22
Smith, W. R.	84
Sneath, E. H.	27
Streeter, H. B.	104, 138
Toy, C. H.	46
Warschauer, J.	22, 32
Weiss, J.	22
Westcott, B. F.	104
Wrede, W.	17

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

Genesis	PAGE
1:26	27, 28
3:5	28
3:16	134
3:22	72
6:2-4	73
15:10	85
15:17	85
15:18	42
Exodus	
20:17	64
21:30	82
24:1-11	105
24:11	85, 105
25:16-21	90
29:38-41	97
31:7	90
35:12	90
38:5-8	90
Leviticus	
16	65, 95
16:2	90
16:13-15	90
18	70
19:17, 18	64
19:20	82
24:11 ff.	28
25:9	98
25:24	82
Numbers	
3:12	82
5:8	98
7:89	90
21:8, 9	98
28	97
29	97
Deuteronomy	
6:4 ff.	64
6:5	64
21:22, 23	86
33:2	74
Judges	
12	42
1 Samuel	PAGE
24:4-6	5
2 Samuel	
15:4	91
19:21	5
Job	
28	26
Psalms	
18:20-24	118
36:10	118
51:6	64
51:10	64, 118
51:11	64, 118
51:10-12	118
59:3	118
82:1 (2)	91
104	52
107	42
107:20	42
130:4	98
139	43
Proverbs	
1:20	27
2:12	27
8:22-31	26
Isaiah	
7:14	3, 11
9:6	5
11:1	6, 12
11:1-8	6
14:9 f.	87
40:2	83
40-55	4
41:26	91
45:13	82
52:13—53:12	83
53	9, 83
53:11	82, 83
55:11	42
63:16	41
Jeremiah	
14:22	41
25:11	15
31:15	12

Ezekiel PAGE
1 ..... 33, 118
1:22 ..... 33, 118
32:21-31 87
43 90
44:27 98

Daniel
7:9 34
7:13 ..... 17, 18
7:25 14
9 15
12:11 15
12:12 15
12:14 15

Amos
5:14 3
5:25 113
8:14 98
9:1 90

Hosea
11:1 ..... 11, 45

Jonah
1-4 51

Zechariah
13:3 42

Wisdom of Solomon
1:7 43
2:23 73
2:24 ..... 65, 73
7:22-30 26
18:14 ff. 33

Ecclesiasticus
24 26
25:24 65
32 (35):5 99

1 Maccabees
4:46 48

Enoch
6-10 64
46 ..... 18, 34
46:1 ..... 18, 34
48:1 34
48:2 f. 17
48-51 88
51 ..... 18, 88

Secrets of Enoch
22 88

IV Esdras PAGE
7:116 ff. 72

Apocalypse of Baruch
29:5 ..... 6, 117
29:6 117
30:1 25

Matthew
1:22 11
2:15 11
2:18 12
2:23 12
4:19 120
5-7 45
5:20 120
5:21-48 ..... 67, 120
7:16, 17 120
7:29 47
10:29 45
11:25-27 45
11:28-30 26
12:31, 32 68
12:40 13
15:19, 20 67
20:28 81
21:27 46
21:37 ..... 66, 121
22:37-40 66
23:23 66
24 ..... 13, 32
25:34-40 121
25:45 46
26:28 84
28:19 ..... 59, 61

Mark
1:22 46
2:27 ..... 68, 120
3:28, 29 68
3:35 120
7:20-23 67
10:45 81
12:32-34 66
13 ..... 13, 32
13:13 121
13:24-27 22
14:22-25 103
14:24 ..... 84, 103

Luke
10:21 45
10:22 45
10:25-28 66
10:33 ff. 121
11:32 12
11:42 66
15:4-10 121

Luke—*Continued* PAGE
15:20 46
15:31 45
17:21 22
21 ..... 13, 32
22:17-21 104

John
1:1 ..... 35, 38
1:1-14 35
1:3 ..... 35, 79
1:5 ..... 35, 76
1:9 ..... 35, 76
1:11 ..... 35, 79
1:12 ..... 35, 140
1:13 ..... 35, 76, 140
1:14 ..... 35, 76, 140
1:18 ..... 38, 60
1:29 97
1:32 36
1:33 36
1:35 97
1:45 140
2 37
2:24 140
2:25 ..... 37, 140
3:5 139
3:8 79
3:14, 15 98
3:16 ..... 55, 85, 99
3:36 ..... 55, 76
4:24 56
5:16 77
5:17 ..... 56, 77
5:18 36
6:32 111
6:42 140
6:63 113
7:39 ..... 58, 140
8:7, 8 79
8:34 ..... 78, *bis*
8:39, 40 79
8:44 79
9:2 ..... 77, 78
10 98
10:10 142
10:17 37
10:18 ..... 37, 140, *bis*
10:22 15
10:30 36
11 37
11:42 37
12:32 98
12:33 140
13:34 141
14:8 57
14:9 36
14-16 13

John—*Continued* PAGE
15:12 141
15:22 78
15:26 58
16:8 76
16:9 76
16:12 139
16:13 ..... 58, 139
16:14 58
17:3 140
17:9 76
17:15, 16 142
17:18 ..... 142 f.
19:11 ..... 77, 78
20:28 38

Acts
2 47
2:17 ff. 48
4:32 122
5 123
6:1 f. 123
7:53 75
8:15 47
8:16 59
10:44, 45 47
15:28, 29 86
19:5 59

Romans
1:4 ..... 88, 130
1:14 128
1:20 73
2:14 73
3:9-18 72
3:21 89
3:25 ..... 90, 91
3:29 49
5:12 ..... 27, 72
5:12-21 27
5:13-21 ..... 27, 74
6:3, 4 ..... 94, 125
6:4-6 ..... 125 f.
7:1-6 89
7:7 ..... 69, 87
7 & 8 93
7:24 ..... 87, 71, 93, 124
7:15-24 71
7:21-23 ..... 71, 124
8:1 ..... 93, 126
8:2 ..... 93, 125
8:5-9 ..... 53, 127
8:6, 7, 9 ..... 53, 127
8:13 71
8:14 53
8:26 ..... 54 f.
9:5 37
9-11 ..... 50, 74

Romans—*Continued* PAGE
11:33 50
11:36 38
15:33 38
16:20 38

1 Corinthians
1:30 26
2:10-16 54
2:16 ..... 21, 54
5:7 ..... 92, 110
6:1 ff. 135
6:12 ..... 70, 128
6:17 128
8:6 51
9:9 52
9:16 128
10:2 92
10:16, 17 109
10:20 107
10:20-22 107
11:23-26 ..... 102 f.
11:25 84
11:29 108
12-14 109
14 47
14:18, 19 ..... 53, 129
14:27, 28 129
15:22 72
15:24 51
15:45-49 27

2 Corinthians
1:3 ..... 51, 52
2:14 126
2:18 127
3:16-18 ..... 27, 54
3:17 127
3:18 ..... 27, 54, 127
4:4 ..... 27, 73
8:9 29
10-13 130
11:31 51
12:1-4 ..... 53, 129
12:1-5 ..... 53, 129

Galatians
1:16 93
1:18 105
2:19 89
2:20 ..... 93, 94, 109, 126
3:13 86
3:19 75
3:20 92
3:27 126
3 & 4 51
4:5 51
4:6 ..... 51, 53

Galatians—*Continued* PAGE
4:19 126
5:19-21 71
5:22-24 127

Ephesians
1:3 51
2:10 127
2:18 52
2:22 126
3:14 52
3:17-19 126
4:6 52
5:2 ..... 92, 110
5:9 127

Philippians
1:21 126
2:5-11 27
2:13 127
3:10 128
3:12 ..... 129 f.
3:15 129
4:18 ..... 92, 110

Colossians
1:3 52
1:12 52
1:16 29
1:17 29
1:19 30
1:24 128
1:27 126
2:9 29
2:13 89
2:14 ..... 89, 94
2:23 127
3:3 126
3:17 52

1 Thessalonians
1:9 & 10 25
3:11-13 38
3:17 25
4:13 ff. 13

2 Thessalonians
2 13
2:1 25
2:8 26

1 Timothy
1:19 134
2:13, 14 75
2:15 ..... 134, *bis*
3:9 134
3:16 38
4:1 133

1 Timothy—*Continued* PAGE
4:6 134
4:10 82
5:8 133
5:19-22 135
6:3 134
6:10 133
6:20 133

2 Timothy
2:2, 3 133
2:19 134
4:7 133
4:9-18 133

Titus
1:9 133
2:1 134
2:13 38
3:8 134

Hebrews
1:1-3 .....31, 74
2:3 .....31, 74
3:12 75
4:12 95
5:10 111
7:16 31
9:5 .....91, 96
9:11 95
9:22 96
10:20 95
11 132
12:1 ff. 132
12:15 132
13:11, 12 .....86, 95
13:11-13 95
13:15 132

James
1:15 75
1:25 136
1:27 137
2:9 .....75, 136
2:9-13 136
2:14-28 136
2:19 136
4:17 75
5:12 137

1 Peter
1:3 130
1:19 94
2:4 130
2:21 131
2:24 93
4:1 131
4:12, 13 131
4:14 131

2 Peter PAGE
1:5-8 137
2:4 73
3:4 14
3:8 15

1 John
1:2 .....35, 139
1:3 .....20, 35, 113, 139
1:5 .....56, 142
1:5-7 142
1:6 35
1:7 .....35, 98, 142
1:8 79
2:1 142
2:2 .....98, 142
2:4 .....77, 78, 141
2:6 .....77, 78, 141
2:17 142
2:20 143
2:22, 23 76
2:27 .....35, 100, 113, 143
3:2 16
3:5 97
3:6 .....141, *bis*
3:15 .....77, 78
3:17 141
3:24 58
4:1-3 35
4:8 .....56 f.
4:9 99
4:10 .....98, 99
4:13 58
4:16 .....56 f., 142
4:19 .....57, 99
5:3 .....76, 141
5:7, 8 58
5:16, 17 78
5:19 79

Jude
6 73
17 137

Revelation
1-3 .....32, 34
4 & 5..... 33
12 33
12:6 15
13:14-16 32
17:10 32
19:11-16 33

Didache
9 & 10..... 106

DATE DUE

BS 2361 .B3 1928

Barton, George Aaron, 1859-

Studies in New Testament Christianity /

829

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BS2361.B3 1928
Barton, Georg Studies in New Testament C
3 0645 0003 2154 3